The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

MANUAL

OF

CHURCH HISTORY.

BY THE

REV. T. GILMARTIN,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH.

The Catholic Theological Union LIBRARY Chicago, Ill.

27H.02 G487M v.2

VOL. II.

SECOND EDITION.

EX LIBRIS PROVINCIAE PRO ST. THEOL. S.S. CORDIS IESU.

Dublin:

M. H. GILL & SON, O'CONNELL-STREET.

BROWNE & NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU-STREET.

LONDON: BURNS & OATES, LIMITED.

1897.

[*All rights reserved.*]

Nihil Obstat.

GUALTERUS M'DONALD, S.T.D.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur.

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublin.,
Hiberniae Primas.

Die 23 Aprilis, 1897.

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LTD., PRINTERS, DUBLIN.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

General Character of the Epoch 1

CHAPTER I.

PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII.

Early life of Gregory - - 2
His elevation to the Papacy - 4
His decrees against simony and immorality - - - 6
He condemns investiture - - 8
His quarrel with Henry IV - 8
Conventicle of Worms - - 10
Excommunication of Henry - 11
Henry at Canossa - - - 14
Election of the antipope Clement III. 16
Henry besieges Rome - - 17
Death of Gregory - - - 19
Charges alleged against him - 20
The temporal power of the Popes - 24

CHAPTER II.

THE CONTROVERSY ON INVESTITURE.

Nature of the controversy - - 27
The oath of homage forbidden - 29
The controversy in France and England - - - 29
The *Privilegium* - - - 32
The Concordat of Worms - - 33

CHAPTER III.

PONTIFICATE OF INNOCENT II.

The schism of Peter Leonis - - 35
Election of Innocent II. - - 36
He withdraws to France - - 37
Termination of the schism - - 40
Second General Council of Lateran - 40

PAGE

Relations between Innocent and the Normans - - - - 41
Republicanism in Rome - - 41

CHAPTER IV.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE HOHENSTAUFENS (FIRST PERIOD).

Frederick Barbarossa - - 43
Hadrian IV. - - - 45
Quarrel between the Pope and Emperor - - - - 47
Alexander III. - - - 50
Election of an antipope - - 51
The Lombard Confederation - 54
The battle of Legnano - - 56
Treaty of Venice - - - 57
Third General Council of Lateran - 57
Death of Frederick I. - - 59
Henry VI. - - - - 60

CHAPTER V.

PONTIFICATE OF INNOCENT III.

Early life of Innocent - - 61
His reformatory zeal - - 63
His relations with Germany - 65
His quarrel with Philip of France - 70
His quarrel with John of England - 73
Cardinal Langton - - - 76
England laid under interdict - 77
John reconciled with the Pope - 78
The Magna Charta - - - 80
Fourth General Council of Lateran - 82
Death of Innocent III. - - 84

25.4.16

PAGE

CHAPTER VI.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE HOHENSTAUFENS (SECOND PERIOD).

Frederick II. - - - 85
Gregory IX. - - - 88
Frederick excommunicated - - 89
His reconciliation with Gregory - 91
Gregory's Decretals - - - 91
Frederick again excommunicated - 93
Innocent IV. - - - 94
First General Council of Lyons - 95
Frederick's reverses - - 98
Conrad IV. - - - - 99
Conradin - - - - 101

CHAPTER VII.

LOUIS IX. OF FRANCE.

Early life of Louis - - - 103
He attains his majority - - 104
His charities - - - 106
His first Crusade - - - 107
He receives ambassadors from the Great Khan - - - 108
The Pragmatic Sanction - - 110
Louis' second Crusade and death - 112

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CRUSADES.

heir general character - - 115
Condition of Palestine - - 116
First Crusade - - - 117
Second Crusade - - - 122
Third Crusade - - - 123
Fourth Crusade - - - 125
Fifth Crusade - - - 127
Remaining Crusades- - - 128
Anti-Catholic Writers on the Crusades - - - - 128
Good effects of the Crusades - 130

PAGE

CHAPTER IX.

NEW RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

(a) *Contemplative Orders* - - 133
Order of Grammont - - 134
Cistercian Order - - 136
Carthusian Order - - 142
Premonstratensian Order - 144
(b) *Orders of Mercy* - - 147
The Anthonists - - 147
The Trinitarians - - 148
The Order of the Blessed Virgin of Mercy - - - 149
(c) *Military Orders* - - 149
The Knights of St. John - 150
The Knights Templars - - 151
The Teutonic Knights - - 153
(d) *Mendicant Orders* - - 154
The Dominicans - - 155
The Franciscans - - 160
The Carmelites - - 169
The Augustinian Friars - 172
Opposition of the Secular Clergy to the Mendicants - - 172

CHAPTER X.

SCHOLASTICISM.

Its characteristics - - - 175
Causes to which it owed its origin - 177
First period of Scholasticism - - 178
St. Anselm - - - 178
Peter Abelard - - - 183
The Sententiaries - - 189
Second period of Scholasticism - 190
Alexander of Hales - - 192
Albert the Great - - 193
Roger Bacon - - - 193
St. Bonaventure - - 194
St. Thomas of Aquin - - 195
John Duns Scotus - - 198
Third period of Scholasticism - 199
Decay of Scholasticism 199

PAGE

CHAPTER XI.

MYSTICISM.

Pagan Mysticism - - - 201
Christian Mysticism - - 201
Scholastic Mysticism - - 202
The German Mystics - - 203
Thomas à Kempis - - 207

CHAPTER XII.

HERETICAL SECTS OF THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES.

(*a*) *The Cathari* - - - 210
Their origin - - - 210
Their doctrines, &c. - - 211
Crusade organized against the Albigenses - - - 214
Capture of Beziers - - 215
(*b*) *The Waldenses* - - 216
Their alleged antiquity - 216
Their errors - - - 218
(*c*) *The Petrobrusians* - - 219
Peter de Bruis - - 219
Henry of Lausanne - - 220

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INQUISITION.

(*a*) *The Roman Inquisition* - 221
Date of its origin - - 222
Heretics condemned to death by the State - - 224
Inquisition introduced into different countries - - 224
The Church charged with intolerance - - - 225
(*b*) *The Spanish Inquisition* - 229
Established by Ferdinand and Isabella - - 229
Established against pretended converts from Islam and Judaism - - - 230
Thomas Torquemada - 232

PAGE

The Spanish Inquisition a State tribunal - - 234
How it is to be judged - 236

CHAPTER XIV.

PONTIFICATE OF BONIFACE VIII.

Celestine V. - - - 238
His resignation - - - 241
His imprisonment and death - 242
Boniface charged with undue severity towards Celestine - - 242
Boniface attempts to settle the affairs of Sicily - - 243
His quarrel with the Calonnas - 244
His quarrel wifh Philip of France 247
His imprisonment and death - 256
The Centennial Jubilee - - 256
Inquiry into charges against Boniface - - - 258

CHAPTER XV.

THE AVIGNON POPES.

The so-called Babylonian Captivity of the Papacy - - - 260
Clement V. - - - 260
John XXII. - - - 265
Nicholas V. (antipope) - - 267
Question of the Beatific Vision - 268
Benedict XII. - - - 270
Clement VI. - - - 273
Rienzi - - - - 274
Innocent VI. - - - 277
Urban V. - - - 277
Gregory XI. - - - 279
The residence of the Popes at Avignon injurious to the Papacy 280

CHAPTER XVI.

SUPPRESSION OF THE KNIGHTS TEMPLARS.

Various abuses among the Templars 282
Philip the Fair imprisons French Templars - - - 284

PAGE

Arrest of Templars in other countries - - - 286
Numerous Templars admit their guilt - - - - 287
Papal Commissioners inquire into the charges against the Templars - - - - 288
The Council of Vienne - - 290
The Bull *Vox in Excelso* - - 291
Festival of Corpus Christi - 294

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.

(*a*) *The Origin of the Schism* - 295
Election of Urban VI. - 296
His severity towards the cardinals - - - 298
Election of Clement VII. - 300
Urban the lawful Pope - 301
(*b*) *The Continuation of the Schism* 302
Urban acknowledged by most of Christendom - - 302
Plans proposed by Paris doctors for the reunion of Christendom - - - 305
Benedict XIII. - - 306
The Saracens in Europe - 308
Innocent VII. - - 309
Gregory XII. - - - 309
Council of Pisa - - 310
Alexander V. - - 312
John XXIII. - - 313
(*c*) *Termination of the Schism* - 314
Council of Constance convoked 314
Questions of Procedure - 315
Decrees of fourth and fifth Sessions - - - 317
Deposition of John XXIII. - 319
Resignation of Gregory XII. - 319
Deposition of Benedict XIII. 320
Election of Martin V. - 320
He confirms decrees of the Council - - - 321

PAGE

CHAPTER XVIII.

COUNCILS OF BASLE AND FLORENCE.

(*a*) *Council of Basle* - - 324
Ceuncil of Pavia - - 324
Council of Basle convoked - 325
Opening of the Council - 325
Council dissolved by Eugene IV. - - - 327
The Pope allows the Fathers to deal with the Hussites - 328
The Bull of Dissolution revoked 329
Council transferred to Ferrara 331
Schismatical Conventicle of Basle - - - 332
Election of an antipope - 333
Decrees of Basle received in France - - 334
(*b*) *Council of Florence* - - 335
Its chief purpose - - 336
Arrival of the Greeks - 336
United Council of Latins and Greeks opens at Ferrara - 337
Question of Purgatory discussed - - - 338
Addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed - - - 339
Council transferred to Florence 339
The Primacy of the Pope - 340
Decree of Union - - 341
Return of Greeks to Constantinople - - - 342
Different sects reconciled with the Church - - 343

CHAPTER XIX.

POPES FROM NICHOLAS V. TO PAUL II.

Nicholas V. - - - 345
Fall of Constantinople - - 346
Revival of Platonic Philosophy - 348
Calixtus III. - - - 349
Turks defeated at Belgrade - 350
Character of Joan of Arc vindicated 351

PAGE

Pius II. - - - - 352
The Bull *Execrabilis* - - 353
Paul II. - - - - 355
His character as described by Platina 356

CHAPTER XX.

THE POPES FROM SIXTUS IV. TO JULIUS II.

The Political Popes - - 358
Sixtus IV. - - - 358
Turks capture Otranto - - 359
Conspiracy against the Medici in Florence - - - 360
Nepotism of Sixtus IV. - - 361
Innocent VIII. - - - 362
Negotiations between himself and Bajazet II. - - - 363
Creation and sale of public offices 364
Alexander VI. - - - 365
Discovery of America - - 366
Bull of Partition - - - 367
Alexander's efforts to promote the interests of his children - 369
Savonarola - - - 371
Julius II. - - - 374
League of Cambray - - 374
The Holy League - - 375
Conventicle of Pisa - - 375
Fifth General Council of Lateran- 376

CHAPTER XXI.

HERETICAL SECTS OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

(*a*) *The Wicliffites* - - 379
John Wicliffe - - 379
Accused of teaching heretical opinions - - - 380
His condemnation and death - 381
His writings and errors - 382
The Lollards - - 383
(*b*) *The Hussites* - - 384
John Huss - - 384
His excommunication - 385

PAGE

His writings - 385
His condemnation by the Council of Constance - 386
Sigismund charged with violating his safe-conduct - 387
Utraquism - - - 388
Hussite wars - - - 389

CHAPTER XXII.

CONDITION OF RELIGION IN THE BRITISH ISLES DURING THIS EPOCH.

(*a*) *In England* - - - 391
Norman Invasion - - 391
Lanfranc - - - 392
St. Anselm and William II. - 393
St. Thomas à Becket - 396
Constitutions of Clarendon - 402
Council of Northampton - 403
Exile of St. Thomas - 404
His martyrdom - - 406
Dispute between the monks of Canterbury and bishops about the election of the Primate - - - 407
The statutes of *Provisors* and *Praemunire* - - 408
The English Church during the fifteenth century - 408
(*b*) *In Ireland* - - - 409
The Irish Church at the beginning of this epoch - - 409
Council of Usney - - 409
Council of Rath-Breasil - 410
St. Malachy - - - 410
Council of Holmpatrick - 412
Synod of Kells - - 413
St. Laurence O'Toole - 413
Arrival of Anglo-Normans in Ireland - - - 414
Synod of Cashel - - 415
Alleged Bull of Hadrian IV.- 416
English ecclesiastics in Ireland 418

	PAGE
Comin, Archbishop of Dublin	419
Dispute between the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin about the Primacy	420
Irish universities - -	422
Statute of Kilkenny - -	422
(*c*) *In Scotland* - - -	423
The Scotch Church during the twelfth century -	423
The Archbishops of Canterbury and York claim jurisdiction over Scotland -	424
Wars between England and Scotland - - -	425
The Scots appeal to Boniface VIII. as their lord suzerain	426
Primacy of Scotch Church -	427

APPENDIX.

List of Popes and Emperors - - - - - - 428
Alphabetical Index - - - - - - - - 433

MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY.

SECOND PERIOD, FROM A.D. 692 TO A.D. 1517.

SECOND EPOCH, FROM A.D. 1073 TO A.D. 1517.

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE EPOCH.

Intimate connection between Church and State.

THIS epoch possesses many features that render it specially interesting to the student of ecclesiastical history. It was the age of the Church's freedom and independence, when she controlled the movements of the State, and frequently inspired its policy, when her religion was the basis of the civil constitution, and when her enemies were punished as the enemies of the State. It was the age of the temporal power of the Popes who presided over the Christian Commonwealth, interpreting its laws, settling disputes between kings and princes, and deposing unworthy rulers. And lastly, it was the age of faith; not as we are sometimes told, of a dead and barren faith; but of an active and energizing faith, which manifested itself in various ways, especially in the Crusades, Scholasticism, Mysticism, and Gothic architecture.

Middle Ages not to be judged by modern ideas.

In passing judgment on the Middle Ages, we must endeavour to divest ourselves of the ideas of the nineteenth century, and to enter into the spirit of those ages, by applying the standard of public morality then recognised. Otherwise we shall be unfair in our criticisms, and we shall invite future generations to deal with us as we have dealt with others.

CHAPTER I.

THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII. (1073-1085.)

The Hildebrandine Age.

WITH the pontificate of Gregory VII. a new era opens in the Church. An era of freedom and independence succeeds one of enslavement; an era of intellectual activity succeeds one of comparative rest; an era of reformatory zeal succeeds one of moral and religious decay. The happy change was mostly the work of the illustrious Gregory VII., "one of the few men who have made and moulded the history of their own and subsequent times."[1] Hence the epoch that commences with his pontificate is frequently spoken of as the Hildebrandine Age.[2]

Early life of Gregory.

Hildebrand—for such was his name before his elevation to the Papacy—was born of humble parents[3] at Soana, in Tuscany, about the year 1020. Even in his early childhood there were not wanting signs that pointed to his future greatness. We are told,[4] for instance, that, on one occasion, while playing at his father's feet, he formed on the ground, with a piece of burned stick, the prophetic words, *Dominaberis a mare usque ad mare* (*Thou shalt rule from sea to sea*). He received his early education in

---

[1] Trench, *Lectures on Med. Ch. History*, 118.

[2] See Voigt, *Hildebrand and his Age*, i., c. 1.

[3] It is generally said that his father was a carpenter, though there are not wanting some who hold that he belonged to the higher walks of life.

[4] Baronius, Ad an. 1073; *Acta Sanctorum*, May 7, vol. xvi., 577.

the monastery of St. Mary, on the Aventine Hill, of which his uncle was superior. Having acquired during his stay here a taste for the monastic state, he crossed the Alps, and directed his steps towards the famous monastery of Clugny, where he made his religious profession.[1] He was not long here till his marked progress in the spiritual life and the ecclesiastical sciences attracted the attention of the Abbot Odilo, who prophesied that he "should one day become great in the sight of the Lord." It was in the halls of Clugny that he imbibed those lofty principles of Church government that guided the future Pontiff. Hence there is a foundation for the statement sometimes made, that "without a Clugny there would scarcely have been a Hildebrand."[2]

He becomes a monk in Clugny.

When his friend, John Gratian, was raised to the Papal throne, in 1044, he went to Rome to assist him by his advice in the government of the Church. On Gratian's resignation, two years later, Hildebrand accompanied him to Germany. Here he remained until the death of his patron, in 1048, when he returned to Clugny.

He had been scarcely a year in Clugny when he was again required to leave his monastic home. Bruno, Bishop of Toul, having been recommended by his uncle, the Emperor of Germany, to the Roman clergy as a worthy successor to the deceased Pontiff, Damasus II., requested Hildebrand to accompany him to Rome. With this request the holy monk complied, though not without some difficulty, for his past experience of public life had but the

Goes to Rome at request of Leo IX. (1049).

---

[1] Paul of Benrieden, *Vita Gregorii, Acta Sanct., ibidem.* Some say that he embraced the religious state before leaving Rome. See Stephens, *Hildebrand and his Times*, 21.

[2] Trench, *Med. Ch. Hist.*, 118.

effect of making him more attached to his monastic cell. Bruno having been elected and proclaimed Pope, under the name of Leo IX. (1049-54), ordained Hildebrand sub-deacon,[1] and appointed him to the abbacy of St. Paul's, in which he reformed some abuses that had crept into the monastery. He was appointed by Leo administrator of the Patrimony of St. Peter, was sent on various important missions to Germany and France, and was made arch-deacon[2] of the Roman Church by Nicholas II. (1058-61). From his arrival in Rome, in 1049, down to his own elevation to the Papacy, Hildebrand was the most prominent figure in the Church. He was chiefly instrumental in the selection of her rulers, inspired their policy, and, under cover of their names, commenced the struggle against the prevalent vices of his age, which he was afterwards to wage more boldly in his own.

Dignities conferred on him.

The time at length arrived when Hildebrand was to add the name of Pope to the Papal authority which he already practically possessed. On the third day following the death of Alexander II. (April 20, 1073), as the obsequies of the deceased Pontiff were being celebrated in the Lateran Church, the immense congregation present cried out as with one voice: "Let Hildebrand be bishop." The cardinals assembled later the same day in the Church of St. Peter ad Vincula, and ratified the choice of the people, declaring that "Hildebrand was a man eminent in piety and learning, a lover of equity and justice, firm in adversity, and temperate in prosperity."[3]

Elected Pope (1073).

The choice appears to have given satisfaction to all, except the elected. He who was unanimously declared to

[1] *Acta Sanct.*, vol. xvi., 580. [2] *Ibid.*, 571. [3] Stephens, 90.

be the most worthy to be Christ's Vicar on earth, deemed himself the most unworthy. He could have been Pope long before, had he not avoided the dignity by putting others forward. He thought, however, there was still a way of escape left to him. By the decree of Nicholas II. on Papal elections, the consent of the emperor should be secured in case he had obtained the personal privilege from the Holy See before the newly-appointed Pope could be consecrated. Though Henry IV. (1056-1106) had not obtained such privilege, Hildebrand, who was generally credited with having inspired the decree of Nicholas II., sought[1] the emperor's approval before allowing the ceremony of his consecration to be performed. He appealed to Henry to withhold his consent, and warned[2] him that if he gave his approval he could not tolerate the emperor's wickedness. The device, however, failed to attain its purpose. Henry, feeling flattered by the application made to him, and considering the threat as not being made in earnest, granted the required approval, and Hildebrand was consecrated Bishop of Rome on the following Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, under the name of Gregory VII.

He asks Henry IV. to approve his election.

His consecration

At the time of Gregory's elevation to the Papacy, the Christian world was in a deplorable condition. In writing to his friend, the Abbot Hugh of Clugny, he declares that he often prayed to God to take him out of life, or to make him useful in stamping out the evils that were everywhere to be seen. "Wherever I turn my eyes," he says,[3] "I

[1] This was the last time that an Emperor was asked to approve a Papal election.

[2] Bonizo, *Liber ad Amicum*. *Lat. Patrol.*, cl. 803. Bonizo was Bishop of Sutri and contemporary with Gregory VII.

[3] Ep., ii. 49.

find subjects of great affliction. . . The Eastern Church has fallen away from the Catholic faith and is now assailed on every side by infidels. If I turn to the west, north, or south, I find everywhere bishops who have obtained their office in an irregular way, whose lives and conversation are strangely at variance with their sacred calling; who go through their duties not for love of Christ, but from motives of worldly gain. There are no longer princes who set God's honour before their own selfish ends, or who allow justice to stand in the way of their ambition . . . And those among whom I live—Romans, Lombards, and Normans—are, as I have often told them, worse than Jews or Pagans."

Condition of Christendom.

The sufferings of the Christians in the East aroused in him feelings of deep sympathy. He resolved to organize a crusade to assist them against their oppressors, and wrote during the first year of his pontificate to Henry IV. to enlist his sympathy in favour of his project. But the complications in which he soon found himself involved prevented him from giving effect to his intentions.

Gregory fully realised that the condition of religion depends almost entirely on the clergy, and that it is vain to expect the people to be good, unless the example of virtue be given by their spiritual guides. Hence he commenced the great work of reformation with the latter. He held a Lenten Synod at Rome, in 1074, in which he condemned the vices of simony and immorality among the clergy, and forbade the people to receive the religious ministrations of such as were guilty of those vices unless they reformed their lives. Though these decrees were merely the re-enactment of similar ones passed by previous Councils and Popes, their promulgation excited a storm of

He condemns simony and immorality (1074).

opposition throughout Italy, Germany, and France. We are told, for instance, that a largely attended synod, held at Paris, condemned the Roman decrees, on the pretence that they implied that the validity of the sacraments depended on the sanctity of the minister. The Bishop of Constance gave public permission to his priests to retain the wives to whom they had been married. And the Bishop of Metz declared that he was powerless to give effect to the decree against clerical concubinage in his diocese.[1]

Opposition to his decrees.

The reason of this opposition is not far to seek. Previous decrees against the vices of the clergy were not generally enforced. But Gregory's character was a sufficient guarantee to all who knew him, that his legislation would not be allowed to remain a dead letter. And the sequel showed that they had not misunderstood their man; for he followed up his decrees by sending legates to different countries fully empowered to depose immoral and simoniacal ecclesiastics, who felt specially indignant at the laity being asked by Gregory to assist in the work of reformation.

Reason of the opposition.

The lay lords, for the most part, used the authority which the connection between the Church and Feudal system gave them, to thwart the Papal legates in the discharge of their onerous duties. It soon became sufficiently clear to Gregory that a complete reformation was impossible, as long as the Church was a slave of the State. Hence he immediately directed his attention to bringing about her freedom and independence. At a numerously attended synod, held at Rome during the month of

He resolves to secure the Church's independence.

[1] Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, iv. 273.

February, 1075, ecclesiastical investiture,[1] at once the symbol and means of the Church's enslavement, was condemned; appointments to benefices in which it would be used were declared invalid; and, finally, ecclesiastics receiving investiture from laymen, as well as laymen conferring it, were excommunicated.

Ecclesiastical investiture prohibited.

Gregory's decree against investiture met with the most determined opposition from the lay lords and simoniacal ecclesiastics. The opposition was headed by Henry IV. of Germany (1056-1106), the son of Henry III., whom he succeeded at the early age of five. His moral training was sadly neglected by his mother, Agnes,[2] as well as by his tutors, who allowed him to follow the bent of his inclination and indulge his passions without restraint.[3] Influenced by political advisers, he married (1066) Bertha, daughter of the powerful Count of Susa, remarkable alike for her beauty of person and for her gentle and amiable disposition. He soon, however, found that his marriage imposed a disagreeable check on his course of wickedness. He sought a divorce, alleging that the marriage had not been valid for want of freedom. He succeeded in winning over to his side Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, who possessed considerable influence with the bishops of Germany. A synod was held at Frankfort, in 1069, to hear the king's application. St. Peter Damian presided as Papal legate. Having heard the frivolous reasons advanced in favour of the royal suit, he refused to sanction a divorce, and

Opposition of Henry IV. of Germany.

---

[1] For meaning of the term, and history of the controversy, see the next chapter.

[2] She afterwards became a nun in the convent of St. Petronilla, at Rome.

[3] "Infeliciter vixit," says the Saxon annalist, "quia sicut voluit vixit." Rob., iv. 269.

threatened the king with various penalties unless he consented to take back his lawful wife. Henry submitted,[1] merely remarking that he had to bear the burden which he could not lay aside. Henry continued, however, to lead a life of gross licentiousness, to the great disedification of his subjects. He was also guilty of various acts of cruelty, and by his tyrannical conduct drove the Saxons to revolt. And, finally, he showed his contempt for the laws of the Church by retaining in his household a number of ecclesiastics who had been excommunicated by Alexander II. "His public acts," says a writer in *The Edinburgh Review*,[2] "might seem to have been prompted by the determination to exasperate to madness the national pride, the moral sense, and the religious feelings of his subjects."

Henry's character.

Gregory, having received various complaints from Germany about the conduct of the emperor, addressed to him a letter couched in terms of paternal kindness, admonishing him to change his manner of life. But the letter had no other effect than to exasperate him against Gregory, and thus prepared the way for the open rupture that occurred between them on the question of investiture.

Admonished by Gregory.

The Papal decree against investiture arrived in Germany at a time when Henry was hard pressed by the Saxons, whom his tyranny had driven to revolt. Being, therefore, not in a position to openly reject it, he professed his readiness to receive it. When, however, he had succeeded

---

[1] Bertha bore him a son (Conrad) in 1073, and a second son (Henry) in 1082. After the birth of the former, Henry treated her with kindness down to the time of her death, in 1088. In the following year he married a Russian princess, named Adelaide, whose treatment was so harsh that she brought a number of charges against him at the Synod of Constance, in 1094.

[2] April, 1845.

in subduing the Saxons (June, 1075), he threw all pretences aside, and publicly conferred ecclesiastical investiture. To answer for his conduct on this, as well as on other points, he was cited to appear, under the penalty of excommunication, at the Lenten Synod to be held at Rome the following year (1076). Henry received the citation in open defiance, and urged the bishops and lay lords to band themselves together against the Pope.

Cited to appear at Rome.

Conspiracy organized against Gregory

A conspiracy was organized by Henry's adherents in Rome to make Gregory prisoner. As the Pope was celebrating midnight mass on Christmas Eve in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, he was seized by an armed band under a Roman noble named Censius. The latter dragged him from the Church by the hair of the head,[1] and cast him into prison, from which, however, he was released on the following day by the indignant Romans. According to some writers,[2] the conspiracy was organized with the knowledge and consent of the king; but, if not with his knowledge, it had certainly his subsequent approval, for Censius was immediately afterwards received at the Court of the Emperor, and Guibert, who was one of the leading spirits in it, was afterwards made antipope.

Charges brought against Gregory at Worms (1076).

Henry convened an assembly of the bishops and abbots of Germany at Worms, in January, 1076. A number of charges were brought against Gregory by Cardinal Hugh the White, who had been recently deposed for forging papal briefs. Notwithstanding the character of the evidence by which the charges were supported, they were

---

[1] Baronius, Ad an. 1075; Lambert of Aschaffenburgh († 1090). *Hist. Chronology*, Ad an. 1076.

[2] Paul of Benrieden, *Life of Gregory*, *Apud Acta Sanctorum*, vol. xvi., 588.

received by the venal creatures of Henry, who undertook to pronounce the sentence of deposition against the Vicar of Christ. The action of this synod was shortly afterwards endorsed by a synod of the simoniacal bishops of Lombardy held at Piacenza. "The conduct of these ecclesiastics is a sufficient proof," says Neander,[1] "of the deplorable effects of investiture and the Church's enslavement." The Pope declared deposed.

Henry made known the decision of the fathers of Worms to Gregory in an insulting letter, addressed to "Hildebrand, no longer Pope, but a false monk," and to the Roman cardinals. The latter were summoned to attend a council to be held in Germany on the coming Feast of Pentecost for the purpose of electing a successor to the deposed Pope. The letter was handed to Gregory as he was opening the Lenten Synod. The reading of it aroused intense indignation among those present. Gregory, who was the only one who appeared to be unmoved, felt that the time had come to take strong action against one who had shown his contempt for the laws of God and man. With the full concurrence of one hundred and ten bishops present at the synod, he pronounced sentence of excommunication against Henry, and declared his subjects released from their oaths of allegiance.[2] He also excommunicated the three leading bishops at the conventicle of Worms, and the Lombard bishops who had approved of their conduct; and a like Henry excommunicated and deposed.

---

[1] *Church History* (Engl. ed.), vii. 146.

[2] "Et omnes Christianos a vinculo juramenti quod sibi fecerunt vel facient absolvo, et ut nullus ei serviat sicut regi interdico." The sentence of deposition does not appear to have been absolute, but merely a provisional suspension of administrative authority, till he should obtain absolution. Jungmann, iv. 287. Doll., iii. 300.

sentence was pronounced against the other German bishops who had been present at Worms, unless they showed signs of repentance before the 29th of June.

Never was the authority of the Holy See more completely vindicated than when, on the publication of the sentence against Henry, he was immediately deserted by all his former followers, with the exception of his wife and a few attendants. For this, indeed, his own wickedness had prepared the way, by alienating the affections of many of his old friends; while the sudden deaths of many of his prominent followers were construed as a sign that Providence was opposed to him.[1] The German bishops who had taken his side, finding that the tide of popular feeling had turned against him, now deserted his cause and sought reconciliation with the Holy See. The Saxons, who had suffered so much from his tyranny, thinking that a favourable opportunity had arrived for asserting their independence, flew to arms. And to complete his humiliation, a Diet[2] of the Empire, held at Tribur in

Effect of the Papal sentence.

[1] Rob., iv. 316.

[2] The Diet was the great Council of the German Empire, in which the higher nobility, lay and ecclesiastical, met their sovereign to deliberate on affairs of national interest. Its chief members were the prince electors, in whose hands the choice of the ruler of Germany was vested. Royalty with the Germans, as with other Teutonic nations, was originally partly elective, and partly hereditary; but after the tenth century, the elective principle prevailed at least in theory. The right of electing the sovereign, which was at first enjoyed by all freemen, was frequently exercised through their chiefs. And thus, by degrees, the electoral rights were restricted, till during the eleventh or twelfth century, they were confined to seven princes—viz., the Archbishops of Mentz, Treves, and Cologne, the Palsgrave of the Rhine, the Marquis of Brandenburgh, and the Dukes of Saxony and Bavaria. The number of electors was increased to eight by the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648, and to nine in 1692, which remained the complete number of the Electoral College till it was finally abolished in 1806. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 225-233.

October, 1076, took the side of Gregory against him. The electors declared that unless Henry became reconciled with the Church within a year he should forfeit the crown;[1] that the question would be finally decided by a Diet to be held at Augsburg on the 2nd of February, 1077; and that, in the meantime, Henry was to live privately, divested of all signs of royalty.

Henry seeks reconciliation with the Holy See

Henry, feeling that the decision of the coming Diet would be adverse to him, determined to get reconciled with the Church before the electors met. For this purpose he sent representatives to Rome: but the Pope refused to accede to their request, as he had promised the electors that the question should be settled at the Diet of Augsburg. The Pope's refusal appears but to have had the effect of making Henry the more anxious to get absolved from the excommunication, for he set out for Italy himself a few days before Christmas, accompanied by his wife, his little child, and a few attendants. As all the mountain passes between Germany and Italy were strictly guarded by his enemies, he was obliged to take a circuitous route through France and the Mount Cenis Pass. In the course of his journey he endured many hardships, as the winter was exceptionally severe.

Gregory, who had started from Rome for Germany on the 12th of January, hearing that Henry had arrived in Lombardy, and fearing his ulterior designs, sought refuge

---

[1] The electors appealed to a law of the Swabian Code, according to which a German ruler should lose the crown if he remained excommunicated for an entire year. Most of the national codes of Christendom at the time contained similar enactments. The English Constitution, for instance, provided for the deposition of a king who showed himself hostile to the Church. *Cambr. Evers.*, translated by Dr. Kelly, ii. 433.

in the strongly fortified castle of Canossa, belonging to the Countess Matilda,[1] of Tuscany, called the Second Deborah, because of her fidelity to the Holy See in its troubles. Thither Henry also directed his steps. He appeared before the castle, clad in the garb of a pilgrim, and requested an interview with the Pope. Gregory, knowing his character well, resolved to try his sincerity before granting his request. Hence he allowed the fugitive king to appear before the castle for three successive days, standing with his feet bare in the snow each day from morning till evening. At length, Gregory, influenced by the apparent sincerity of Henry's conversion, as well as by the entreaties of Matilda[2] and other friends in his favour, admitted him to an interview. On his expressing regret for his past conduct, and promising to appear at the coming Diet,[3] he was absolved from the censure of excommunication. He was, however, required to abstain from conducting himself as king till the electors should meet at Augsburg. Gregory immediately addressed a letter to the German bishops, setting forth the reasons that had influenced him in absolving Henry before the meeting of the Diet.

Henry at Canossa (1077).

His absolution.

Henry had scarcely left Canossa when he was surrounded by many of the simoniacal bishops and lay lords of Lombardy, who besought him to take their side against the

---

[1] Matilda on this occasion made a grant of all her estates to Gregory and his successors. This grant was afterwards renewed.

[2] She was nearly related to Henry, through her mother, who was his cousin.

[3] According to some contemporary writers, *v.g.*, Bonizo and Donizo, he received Holy Communion on this occasion. According to others, however, *v.g.*, Lambert of Hersfeld and Berthold, on being invited by the Pope to receive the Eucharist if his conscience testified to his innocence, he abstained.

Pope. They even went so far as to threaten, that, if he refused, they would set up a rival in the person of his youthful son, Conrad. Their devices were successful. Henry openly espoused their cause, assuring them that he had submitted to the Pope merely to meet a passing necessity, and that he would have full revenge for the recent indignities to which he had been subjected.

He returns to his old policy.

The Diet that had been convoked to meet, at Augsburg, on the 2nd February, was not held, as Henry had not yet returned from Italy. Neither could Gregory have been present, in accordance with his undertaking, as the passes of the Alps were closely watched by the king's partizans, with strict orders not to allow the Pope to enter Germany. A Diet was held, however, six weeks later at Forcheim, at which the Pope, who could not be personally present, was represented by two legates. The electors were so dissatisfied with Henry's wicked and deceitful conduct, that, notwithstanding the appeals of the legates in his favour, they declared him deposed, and elected in his place Rudolph,[1] Duke of Swabia, well known for his high character and his attachment to the Church.

Diet of Forcheim

A civil war ensued which continued to distract Germany for over three years. The division, which was at first confined to the State, soon extended to the Church, with the result that many dioceses had two bishops, each representing one of the contending factions. "The anarchy in Germany was frightful. Neither Henry nor Rudolph dared execute justice from fear of alienating their followers.

Civil war between Henry and Rudolph.

---

[1] Rudolph was connected with Henry and Bertha, having married successively a sister of each. On his diadem appeared the remarkable words: "Petra (*i. e.*, Christus) dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolpho."

Violence met with no check; nobles and knights built castles and lived by robbery, and the wretched people were ground to the dust by oppression of every kind."[1] Each of the rivals endeavoured to gain over the Pope to his side; but without effect. Gregory sought rather to bring about peace, without publicly espousing the cause of either; and when his legate excommunicated Henry at the Synod of Goslar (November, 1077), he refused to ratify the sentence.

Henry was the worst enemy of his own cause. In violation of the ecclesiastical canons, he continued to appoint to benefices, to confer investiture, and to oppress the Church in various ways. Gregory, at length, finding that the efforts he had hitherto used to restore peace to Germany were fruitless, resolved to have recourse to stronger measures. Henry's open hostility to the Church left the Pope no option between the rivals. Hence, at a synod held in Rome on the 7th of March, 1080, sentence of excommunication and deposition was pronounced against Henry, and Rudolph was declared King of Germany.

Henry again excommunicated (1080).

Henry retaliated by holding a council of his adherents at Brixen, under the presidency of the deposed cardinal, Hugh the White. There were thirty bishops present, besides a large number of inferior ecclesiastics and lay men. A list of charges, similar to those already brought forward at Worms, was drawn up against Gregory by Hugh the White. The Pope was declared guilty, and sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. The bishops proceeded forthwith, by order of the emperor, to fill the see thus declared vacant. Their choice fell on Guibert, the oft-excommunicated archbishop of Ravenna, who took the

An antipope elected by the Imperialists.

[1] Rob. iv. 331.

name of Clement III. One of the first acts of the antipope was to pronounce sentence of excommunication against Rudolph, Henry's enemy. The death of Rudolph shortly afterwards from a wound[1] received in a battle fought on the banks of the Saale (October 15th, 1080), practically decided the quarrel in Henry's favour. Henceforth he was acknowledged throughout most of Germany and Italy, though the Saxons and Swabians, who were unwilling to submit to his tyrannical yoke, elected a successor to Rudolph in the person of Count Herman of Luxemburg.

Death of Rudolph (1080).

Though the political quarrel appeared to have ended in Henry's favour, his schismatical conduct rendered it impossible that he should be recognised by the Holy See. The sentence of his excommunication was renewed at the Lenten Synod held at Rome in 1081. He immediately crossed the Alps at the head of a large army, accompanied by the antipope, intending to settle the dispute between himself and Gregory by an appeal to arms. Shortly after entering Lombardy he defeated the troops of Matilda. He then directed his steps towards Rome, where he appeared on the eve of Pentecost. Contrary to his expectation, he found the gates of the city shut against him, and proceeded to lay siege to it. The siege continued with some interruptions till 1083, when he succeeded in making himself master of the Leonine portion of the city, while the rest remained in the hands of the Pope. Henry made various overtures towards a reconciliation; but Gregory refused to entertain them except on the condition of his submitting to the judgment of the Church. After some time, however,

Sentence of excommunication renewed against Henry (1081).

He besieges Rome.

[1] Said to have been inflicted by Godfrey of Bouillon, the leader of the First Crusade.

it was agreed to leave the settlement of the dispute to a synod, which Gregory promised to convoke on the withdrawal of Henry's forces from Rome.

The proposed synod was held in the month of November, 1083. Very few bishops were present, as many of those on their way to the council were arrested by order of Henry, though he had promised on oath not to interfere with them. Gregory refused to absolve him except on the conditions of his consenting to do penance for his past conduct; and excommunicated all those who prevented the bishops from coming to Rome. The emperor, though not named, was well known to be included in the censure.

Arrest of bishops on their way to Rome (1083).

Henry returned to Rome early in the following year, and succeeded in gaining an entrance into the city on the 21st of March. Gregory withdrew to the Castle of St. Angelo, where he was secure against the attacks of his enemies. The antipope was formally enthroned in St. Peter's on Palm Sunday; and, on Easter Sunday, Henry and his consort received the imperial crown from his hands. Henry's sway in Rome was of brief duration. Robert Guiscard,[1]

Henry crowned by antipope (1084).

---

[1] Norman adventurers settled down in Southern Italy early in the eleventh century and conquered Apulia from the Greeks, their first stronghold being Aversa, which they founded in 1029. Their chiefs were known as the Dukes of Apulia. They soon showed the predatory habits of their race by pillaging churches and monasteries, and invading neighbouring territories. Having seized on some of the Patrimony of St. Peter, in Southern Italy, Leo IX. led an army against them in 1053; but he was defeated and taken prisoner near Civitella. The Pope, however, had soon the pleasure of seeing the victors cast themselves at his feet suing for pardon. They consented to hold Apulia as a fief of the Holy See, as well as whatever other territories they might conquer from the Saracens and Greeks in Southern Italy and Sicily.

Among the Norman chiefs in Italy Robert Guiscard (the Wise) holds the foremost place. He was born in Lower Normandy in 1015. Having

the famous Norman Chief, who was a vassal of the Holy See, marched on Rome in obedience to the summons of his feudal lord. The Germans, afraid to meet the Norman soldiers, fled from Rome, taking with them the antipope, upon which Gregory regained his former freedom. Forced to withdraw from Rome

Robert withdrew from Rome after a brief stay, and was accompanied by Gregory as far as Salermo. Here the latter held a Synod in November, 1084, and renewed the sentence of excommunication against Henry, Guibert, and their adherents.. Taking ill shortly afterwards, he died on the 25th of May, 1085, his last words being, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore do I die in exile;" upon which a bishop who was present is said to have exclaimed: "My lord, he cannot die in exile who has received from God the whole world as his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession." Gregory died apparently vanquished; but the principles, as we shall see, for which he struggled during his life, remained and triumphed in the end. Death of Gregory VII. (1085).

Various charges, as we have seen, were alleged against Gregory by his enemies during his lifetime. Such is the

---

emigrated to Italy at an early age, he soon distinguished himself in the wars carried on between his countrymen and the neighbouring princes. He became Duke of Apulia in 1058, and soon extended the Norman sway over most of Southern Italy. Having invaded some of the Papal possessions he was excommunicated by Nicholas II.; but a reconciliation was shortly afterwards (1059) effected between them. Robert consented to receive Apulia and Calabria as fiefs of the Holy See, and promised to pay an annual tribute: while Nicholas acknowledged his title as Duke of Apulia and Calabria. During the pontificate of Gregory VII. he again invaded the Papal possessions, for which he was excommunicated. A reconciliation was, however, brought about between them in 1080, through the mediation of the Abbot of Monte Cassino. Robert died in 1085, leaving to his brother Roger to establish the Norman supremacy over Sicily.

Charges against Gregory.

penalty, or as some would express it, the privilege, of greatness. As some of these charges have been repeated by anti-papal writers of more recent times, we shall examine briefly those most frequently referred to.

In the first place, he has been charged with immorality. The only argument adduced in support of this charge is that he lived on friendly terms with Matilda of Tuscany, who was ever ready to defend him in time of necessity, and bequeathed her possessions to him and his successors. Such devotion on the part of Matilda to the Holy See would be accepted as a proof of guilt only by those who live in the atmosphere of suspicion, and who cannot realize the filial relations existing between the Head of the Church and his children scattered throughout the world.

His alleged immorality.

In justification of Gregory it is sufficient to appeal to the spirit of piety that breathes through his letters to Matilda, as well as to the testimony of his contemporary, Lambert of Hersfeld. "The falsehood," writes the latter,[1] "of the charges made against Gregory is clearer than the light. . . . The wonders wrought by his prayers, as well as his fervent zeal for the glory of God and the exaltation of His Church, are a sufficient answer to the poisoned reports of his detractors." Hence the Anglican historian, Canon Robertson, writes[2] with his usual candour:—"The attachment with which she (Matilda) devoted herself to the Pope was a mark for the slander of Gregory's enemies, but needs no other explanation than that acquaintance with her from her early years, which had given him an opportunity of imbuing her mind with his lofty ecclesiastical principles,

---

[1] *Annales*, Ad an. 1077. Migne, *Lat. Patr.*, vol. cxlvi., 1242.

[2] *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, vol. iv., 321.

and of gaining over her the influence of a spiritual father."

Secondly, Gregory has been charged with ambition and hostility to the rights of kings and princes, because of his declarations and conduct on various occasions. In writing, for instance, to the King of Aragon, he speaks of the Pope "being set over the kingdoms of the earth." Again, when presiding at the Roman Synod, held in 1080, he maintained that "the Pope, guided by his synod, can bestow and take away kingdoms and principalities." And, finally, in replying to Herman, Bishop of Metz, who had written to ask on what principle he had acted in deposing kings, he appealed to the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal power, as "royalty had its origin in human pride, and therefore in Satan; whereas the priesthood was established by God."[1] These and similar statements show, we are told, that Gregory looked on the royal authority as absolutely dependent on the Holy See, and as coming from a source different from that of the priesthood.

His alleged hostility to the rights of kings.

To show that Gregory's views on the relation between the spiritual and temporal powers were orthodox, it will be sufficient to refer to other parts of his writings, in which he lays down that the authority of princes comes from God, and that it is independent within its legitimate sphere. Thus in writing to Harold, King of Denmark, he speaks of "his kingdom being entrusted to him by Divine Providence:" and in writing to Henry IV. he appeals to him to guard the interests of Germany, "the government of which had been committed to him by God." The former statements of Gregory must be obviously interpreted in

His teaching on the relation between spiritual and temporal powers orthodox.

[1] Ep., vii. 21; Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vi., pt. i., 1469.

the light of the latter; in which way it can be easily shown that his teaching did not differ from the usually received opinion regarding the source of the royal power and its independence. Thus, his remark about the Pope being placed over the kingdoms of the earth, refers to the spiritual jurisdiction enjoyed by him as the Vicar of Christ; while, by the authority which he claimed to depose kings and princes, he understood the indirect temporal power conceded to the Papacy by most Catholic canonists in all ages of the Church. And in ascribing the origin of the royal power to pride, he speaks of the historical origin, or that which led to the institution of kings: and not of the source of that power, which, following the teaching of St. Paul, he proclaims to be God.

The proof, however, on which Gregory's enemies rely most confidently to show his ambitious designs, and his opposition to the power of royalty, is derived from his conduct towards the princes of Christendom, in seeking to make some his vassals, and deposing others. He sent a legate, for instance, to William the Conqueror of England, urging him to pay the Peter's pence due from his kingdom, and to swear fidelity[1] to the Holy See. William, in replying,[2] expressed his readiness to comply with the first part of the injunction, but refused to take the oath of fidelity, as he could not discover that any of his predecessors had done so.

He asks William I. of England to take the oath of fidelity.

[1] There was a special reason why the Pope should ask William to promise fidelity to the Holy See, as he had already shown a strong tendency to interfere with the liberties of the Church by preventing bishops of the country from passing laws, from going to councils to which they were summoned, and from punishing the chief vassals of the Crown without his consent. Jungmann, iv. 308.

[2] Migne, *Lat. Patr.*, cxlviii. 747.

The fidelity demanded by Gregory was not that of a vassal to his liege lord, but rather the fidelity in spiritual matters of a Christian prince to the Head of the Church. For of such fidelity only is there question in the various letters addressed by him to William that have come down to us. Or perhaps it was the fidelity due to the Holy See from the king of a country placed under its special protection. For Alexander II., who is said to have blessed the standard of William the Conqueror when about to invade England, spoke of that country as being under the "special protection of the Pope."[1] It was quite usual for princes during the Middle Ages to place their possessions for greater security under the protection of the Holy See. And even many kings did not deem it unworthy of them to deliver up their kingdoms to the Holy See, and receive them back as fiefs; for at the time such a state of vassalage ensured more stability in their thrones than any military force they could command.

The nature of the oath required

Gregory's arrogance, we are told, reached its height in his presuming to absolve the subjects of Henry IV. from their oaths of allegiance. This charge is based on complete ignorance of the relations between the Holy See and Christian princes during the Middle Ages. That the Popes at that time possessed authority to depose kings, there can be no doubt, for it was frequently exercised by them, and it was acknowledged throughout Christendom. The origin,[2] however, of this authority has been variously explained by different writers. Some, following the opinion of the illustrious Fenelon, maintain that it was of

Gregory's action in absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance considered

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vi., part i., 1086.

[2] For a full exposition of the different views on this subject, see Gosselin's *Temporal Power of the Popes*, translated by Dr. Kelly of Maynooth.

human origin, being derived either from the constitutions of particular States, or from the general consent of Christian nations. Others teach that it is of divine institution. These latter, however, differ among themselves as to whether the temporal power which they maintain Christ bestowed on St. Peter and his successors is *direct*, as some writers held during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; or merely *indirect*, as most Catholic canonists teach, *i.e.*, such as required in the interests of the Church and society. Whatever may be said about the truth of these different opinions, it appears certain from various letters written by Gregory, especially from his letter to Herman of Metz, that he looked on the authority which he claimed to depose princes as coming immediately from God.

The temporal power of the Popes.

Gregory used the temporal power, which he undoubtedly possessed, not for any low or selfish purpose, but for the good of society. He sought to secure the freedom and independence of the Church; to check the tendency of his age to confound right with might; and to restrain[1] the

Used by Gregory for the good of society.

[1] The chief rights and privileges said to have been claimed for the Papacy by Gregory are set forth in a document known as the Dictate, consisting of twenty-seven brief propositions (Hard., ii., part i., 1304), jotted down, apparently without any regard to order. Among the other rights which it claims for the Pope are, that he is alone universal Pontiff; that his legates should take precedence of all bishops; that he is the supreme judge of all questions of right and wrong; that he alone can depose and reinstate bishops; that he alone can wear the imperial insignia; that he alone can depose kings and emperors; and that all persons should kiss his feet.

The authenticity of the Dictate is the subject of considerable controversy. Baronius maintains that it was compiled by Gregory. Others, as Natalis Alexander, think that it was neither complied by Gregory nor represents his views. While others, as Hefele, hold that it was not written by Gregory; but that it represents his views. See Jungmann, iv. 315; and Wouters, vol. iv., Dissert. ix.

excesses of kings and princes, by making them feel that there was a tribunal on earth to which they, in common with all Christians, were bound to submit. "We are vaguely told," says[1] Count De Maistre, "of the excesses of Gregory VII. and the superiority of modern times. But what right have the days of rebellion to laugh at those of dispensations? The Pope no longer absolves from the oath of fidelity, but the people absolve themselves—they rebel, they depose their princes, they poniard them, they send them to the scaffold."

Gregory's policy was to unite the nations of Christendom into a grand confederacy, with God as its King, and the Gospel as the basis of its constitution. In such a Theocracy the Pope and the Church would have paramount influence, as the authoritative exponents of the Divine Law, in checking the lawlessness of the age, and putting an end to the general confusion that had prevailed so long throughout Europe. "The theory," says[2] Dean Milman, "of Augustine's *City of God*, swam before the mind of the Pontiff in which a new Rome was to rise and rule the world by religion." No one who has studied the history of the eleventh century can fail to appreciate the beneficial results of Gregory's policy. "It was conducive," says the writer in *The Edinburgh Review* already referred to, "perhaps essential, to the progress of Christianity and civilization; its abandonment would have plunged the Church and the world into the same hopeless slavery."

Gregory's general policy.

Gregory's character is one of the noblest enshrined in

---

[1] *The Popes* (Engl. ed.), 196.

[2] *Latin Christianity*, iii. 200.

the pages of history. Who can study his life—his rise from one of the lowest to the highest position on earth; his strict asceticism; his struggles, almost single-handed, against the vices of his age; and his death in exile, confident in the justice of his cause—without paying to him the tribute of his praise and admiration? Dean Milman speaks of him as one "whose character is contemplated with awe," and who made the world feel "that there was some being, even on earth, whose special duty it was to defend the defenceless, to succour the succourless, to be the refuge of the widow and the orphan, and to be the guardian of the poor." And Archbishop Trench asks:[1] "Who can refrain from admiring the mighty energy of will which enabled this man, in defiance of such opposition, to bring the Church upon new lines, lines upon which for centuries after it ran?" But, perhaps, the highest tribute to his greatness was paid by Napoleon I., who, when musing in St. Helena on the great ones who have figured in the world's history, declared that if he was not Napoleon he would be Hildebrand.

His character.

[1] *Lectures on Med. Ch. History*, 130

CHAPTER II.

THE CONTROVERSY ON INVESTITURE.

Nature of the controversy.

THIS controversy regarded the right claimed by kings, princes, and lay lords, to invest bishops and other ecclesiastics with the temporalities of their benefices. It began with the pontificate of Gregory VII., and continued, in one form or another, to distract the Church for centuries.

As we have seen,[1] the Feudal System which sprung up in Europe, early in the ninth century, soon affected the relations between Church and State. The Carlovingian kings, anxious to have trustworthy vassals, made large grants of territories to bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, investiture being conferred by the transfer of the ring and crozier, accompanied by a suitable form of words such as "receive this Church." At first bishops were invested with the temporalities of their sees only after canonical election. As long as this practice continued there could be nothing seriously objectionable in investiture. But, when it took the place of canonical election, as it did during the tenth and eleventh centuries, it became the source of great mischief to the Church, and the fruitful parent of those vices that disgraced the character of the clergy of Europe at the time.

The Church and Feudal System, in Germany.

When Gregory VII. took the work of reformation in hands he soon discovered that it was impossible to

[1] Vol. i., 498.

eradicate the vices of his age, without removing the source from which they sprang. Hence, he held a synod at Rome, in 1075, in which he forbade ecclesiastics, under the penalty of excommunication, to receive investiture from the hands of laymen, appealing in defence of his action to the decrees of the seventh [1] and eighth [2] General Councils, which forbade laymen to interfere in ecclesiastical appointments. In issuing this decree Gregory was principally influenced by the desire to put an end to the enslavement of the Church. But he was also influenced by the incongruity of ecclesiastics placing their hands between the blood-stained hands of lay lords when taking the oath of homage which accompanied investiture; as well as by the danger lest the uneducated should be led by the spiritual symbols used in conferring investiture to look on kings and princes as the source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The controversy begins with Gregory VII.'s decree against Investiture (1075).

The controversy which commenced with Gregory's decree against investiture, raged, as we have seen, with special fury during the remainder of his pontificate. Nor did it terminate with his death. He died apparently vanquished; but his spirit lived after him and animated his successors, till the cause of ecclesiastical independence for which he had fought triumphed in the end; not however, without a severe and protracted struggle.

It continues after his death.

---

[1] "Omnis electio episcopi, presbyteri vel diaconi a principibus facta maneat irrita, secundum regulam quae dicit: Si quis episcopus saecularibus potestatibus usus ecclesiam per ipsos obtinuerit deponatur et segregetur, omnesque qui illi communicant." Can. 3, Hard., iv. 487.

[2] "Haec sancta et universalis synodus . . . statuit atque promulgavit, neminem laicorum principum et potestatum semet inferre electioni vel promotioni patriarchae, vel metropolitae, aut cujuslibet episcopi, ne inordinata hinc et incongrua fiat confusio vel contentio." Can. 22, Hard., v. 909.

On his death-bed Gregory named four whom he deemed worthy to succeed him, viz., Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino; Otho, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia; Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons; and Anselm, Bishop of Lucca. Of these, Desiderius was elected and consecrated Pope, under the name of Victor III. During his brief pontificate (1086-87) he followed strictly in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor, and held a synod at Capua, in the month of August, 1087, at which he renewed the condemnation of investiture.

Victor's successor, Urban II. (1088-99), the second of those named by Gregory on his death-bed, frequently condemned investiture. And he had a canon[1] enacted by the Council of Clermont (1095) forbidding ecclesiastics to take the oath of homage. This oath was condemned, both because of the ceremonies accompanying it, and because lay lords claimed, by virtue of it, complete control over bishops, sometimes requiring them to render personal service, and even prohibiting[2] them to attend synods or appeal to Rome without the consent of their feudal superiors.

The oath of homage forbidden (1095).

Philip of France (1060-1108) was the first sovereign to yield obedience to the decrees of the Church, by granting freedom of election throughout his kingdom, abolishing investiture, and substituting the simple oath of fidelity for that of homage. His example was partially followed by Henry I. of England (1100-35), who, influenced by the

The controversy in France and England.

---

[1] Can. 17: "Vetat ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciat."

[2] Thus William Rufus refused permission (1095) to St. Anselm to go to Rome to receive the pallium, and threatened him that by going without permission he would commit a grave violation of his feudal obligations.

representations of Paschal II. and St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, abolished investiture, but insisted on the continuance of the oath of homage. Henry's claim on the latter point was tolerated in the hope that on a little reflection his better judgment would prevail.

In Germany.

There was little or no prospect of a settlement of the controversy in Germany as long as Henry IV. lived. He remained obstinate to the end in maintaining his claims against the liberties of the Church and in adhering to the schismatical faction[1] which he had created. After being deposed (1104) by his son Henry, who rose in arms against him, he died suddenly at Liège, in 1106, without being reconciled to the Church. A contemporary chronicler in commenting on his death, exclaims:[2] "Praise be to God, who tardily, it is true, but nevertheless, with awe-inspiring effect, has given victory to His Church: the same Galilean, who of old vanquished Julian, has made for her the fiftieth year of the new Nabuchodonosor a year of real jubilee."

Henry V. (1106-25).

The prospects of peace, however, improved with the accession of his son, Henry V. (1106-25). Though the new king insisted, at first, on the practice of investiture, he openly avowed his desire for a reconciliation between the Papacy and the Empire. This desire was fully reciprocated by the pacific Paschal II., who was Pope at the time. Paschal had been formerly a monk in Clugny, and had been raised to the cardinalate by Gregory VII. He was favourably known for his piety and asceticism; and

---

[1] The antipope, Clement III., died in 1100, and was succeeded by Theodoric (1100), Albert (1102), and Sylvester IV. (1105-11). The las three, however, had but very few followers.

[2] Milman, ii. 503.

possessed more of the qualities of the monk than of the churchman. He inaugurated his pontificate (1099-1118) by renewing the condemnation of investiture in a synod held at Rome, in 1101. But his subsequent conduct showed that he lacked the experience and firmness of character needed to defend the interests of the Church in the difficult circumstances in which he was placed.

Paschal II. 1099-1118).

Henry urged Paschal, through his representatives, to approve of investiture, and invited him to a conference in Germany on the points in dispute. As the Pope refused to comply with Henry's wish on either point, the latter, following the example of his father, crossed the Alps, in 1110, at the head of a large army, determined to enforce his views by an appeal to arms. Having reduced some of the rebellious Lombard cities to subjection, he sent ambassadors to Rome to arrange about his imperial coronation. Negotiations were opened between Henry and Paschal, which ended in a convention held at Sutri, in 1111, between the representatives[1] of the Pope and of the king. The preliminaries of a concordat were agreed to, by which Henry was to resign all claims to investiture, while Paschal, influenced by the views of ecclesiastical poverty he had imbibed in Clugny, undertook to oblige the German ecclesiastics to deliver up all fiefs held by them from the king.

Negotiations between him and Henry V.

Henry immediately marched to Rome, in accordance with the agreement entered into at Sutri, to receive the imperial crown. Just as all preparations had been made for the ceremony, the terms of the concordat became public, and excited such a storm of opposition among the ecclesiastics

[1] Henry himself was also present.

who held fiefs from the crown, that the Pope felt obliged to recede from his undertaking. The king insisted on his right to be crowned emperor, as he was prepared to carry out his part of the concordat. The Pope, however, refused to yield to his demand; upon which he and the cardinals were cast into prison. After being confined for sixty days, Paschal, fearing[1] that a schism would arise if he held out any longer, consented to allow Henry to confer investiture on those bishops who had been freely elected, and promised not to inflict any censure on those who had outraged his person. The Pope and cardinals were forthwith released, and Henry V. was crowned emperor in St. Peter's, on the 13th of April, 1111.

The Privilegium.

The concession wrung by violence from Paschal is known in history as the Privilegium. As soon as its terms became known it was strongly condemned by many as prejudicial to the liberties of the Church, and opposed to the canons of General Councils. Paschal was so moved by the general expression of dissatisfaction at his conduct that he contemplated resigning the Papacy, and withdrew to the island of Ponza, where he remained in solitude for some time. He consented, however, at the urgent entreaties of the cardinals, to resume the duties of his office; and submitted the whole question to the decision of a council of one hundred and ten bishops, which he held in the Lateran Church, in March, 1112. The Fathers condemned the Privilegium; but abstained from pronouncing any censure against those who had been guilty of violence in extorting it, out of respect for the Pope's promise.

Condemned by Lateran Council (1112).

[1] Paschal himself thus briefly explains the motive of his action:—"Cogor pro Ecclesiae liberatione ac pace hoc pati hoc permittere quod pro vita mea nullatenus consentirem." Apud Watterich, *Vitae Pont. Rom.*, ii. 69.

The Privilegium was also condemned by a council held six months later at Vienne, under the presidency of Guido, the archbishop of the diocese, acting as Papal legate. The fathers of Vienne went so far as to declare it *heretical*. But we must remember that the term was frequently used during the Middle Ages to designate not only doctrines opposed to revealed truth, but also those vices that were specially injurious to the interests of religion. They also pronounced sentence of excommunication against Henry for his harsh treatment of Paschal. The action of the Council of Vienne was severely censured by many French bishops, who, under the leadership of the learned canonist Ivo, Bishop of Chartres (†1117), defended Paschal against the charge of heresy, and maintained[1] that investiture, preceded by canonical election, was lawful in itself, and, therefore, could be permitted by the Pope; but that it was expedient to prohibit it as it was so liable to abuse in the hands of laymen.

Condemned as heretical by Council of Vienne (1112).

The controversy was set at rest for a time during the pontificate of Calixtus II.,[2] the second successor of Paschal, by the Concordat of Worms (1122). The emperor agreed to resign his claim to investiture by *the ring and crozier*, to grant freedom of canonical election and consecration, and to restore to the Holy See all the possessions taken from it since the beginning of his father's reign; while the Pope allowed investiture[3] by the sceptre, and the presence of the

The Concordat of Worms (1122).

[1] See Ivo, Epp., 233, 236, &c. Migne, *Lat. Patr.*, clxii.

[2] At the time of his election he was Archbishop of Vienne, and had presided at the council held there in 1112. He was brother of the Duke of Burgundy, and connected by blood with most of the royal families of Europe. The influence which he could, therefore, command specially fitted him to settle the vexed controversy on investiture.

[3] It was to be granted before consecration in Germany, and within six months after consecration in other parts of the empire.

king or his representatives at episcopal elections, provided there was no simony or violence. Doubtful elections were to be referred to the decision of the metropolitan and his suffragan bishops.

This concordat was solemnly approved in 1123 by the ninth Ecumenical or first General Council of Lateran. The advantages which it secured to the Church are obvious. First, the symbols formerly used in conferring investiture, which were so liable to be misunderstood by the uneducated, were abolished. And secondly, there was ample provision made for the freedom of canonical election.

Advantages secured by it to the Church.

There was no reference to the oath of homage in the Concordat of Worms. It continued to be required of the ecclesiastical vassals of the crown till it was abolished by Henry's successor, Lothaire II. (1125-37), who substituted for it the ordinary oath of fidelity.

CHAPTER III.

THE PONTIFICATE OF INNOCENT II. (1130-43).

THE pontificate of Innocent II. is rendered memorable in the history of the Church by the schism of Peter Leonis, the celebration of the tenth Ecumenical Council, and the revolutionary disturbances caused in Rome and throughout Italy by the preaching of Arnold of Brescia.

Schism of Peter Leonis.

The circumstances that led to the schism of Peter Leonis are variously described by different writers. We shall follow the account handed down by the most reliable contemporary authorities.[1]

His early life.

On the death of Honorius II. (1124-30), two candidates were elected to the Papal Chair by the rival factions into which the cardinals were divided; viz., Cardinal Gregory, who was favourably known for his piety and learning, and Cardinal Peter Leonis, a man of boundless ambition. The latter belonged to a wealthy Jewish family that had been converted during the pontificate of Leo IX. (1049-54)—hence called the "Leonine family." After completing his studies at Paris he became a monk in the monastery of Clugny. He was created cardinal by Paschal II., and was sent on various important missions to France and England. We are told[2] that he used his

[1] Innocent II., in his letter announcing his election to the princes of Christendom; St. Bernard; Henry, Bishop of Lucca, in his letter to St. Norbert, who had asked for information on the subject; Boso, in his *Life of Innocent II.*

[2] Henry of Lucca, Migne's *Lat. Patrol.*, clxxix. 40-42.

office to exact large sums of money from the clergy and laity, and that he went even so far as to melt down the plate of the churches, employing Jews in a work in which Christians refused to take part. By the free expenditure of the money he had thus amassed he gained over to his side many of the cardinals, while the wealth and influence of his family secured for him a large following among the Roman nobles.

His wealth.

Peter's desire to rule from the Chair of St. Peter was well known to his colleagues. Those of them who were interested in the welfare of the Church adopted precautionary measures to prevent him attaining the object of his ambition. Shortly before the death of Honorius, which occurred on the 12th of February, they made a proposal which was finally accepted by all the cardinals, to the effect that the election of the next Pope should be committed to eight of their body, and that the majority of the votes should be decisive. Immediately after the death of the Pope the electoral committee resolved to proceed at once with the election of a successor, to prevent the disturbances which were anticipated in Rome. They had the remains of the deceased Pope interred early on the morning of the 13th,[1] and forthwith entered into conclave in the Church of St. Andrew, attached to the monastery of St. Gregory. Peter Leonis, who was one of the committee, finding that he had no chance of election, withdrew from the conclave, accompanied by one of his two followers present. Four of the six that remained behind gave their votes to Cardinal Gregory,

Measures adopted to prevent his election

Election of Innocent II. (1130).

[1] Custom prescribed that the deceased Pope should be buried before proceeding with the election of a successor.

who was proclaimed Pope under the name of Innocent II. Later the same day a rival conclave was held by the dissenting cardinals and their episcopal followers in the Church of St. Mark, which resulted in the election of Peter under the name of Anacletus II.

Election of an Antipope.

From the account thus given of the circumstances of the double election, it is obvious that though Anacletus[1] is said to have succeeded afterwards, by various devices, in gaining a majority among the cardinals, Innocent was lawful Pope. For the cardinals bound themselves before the conclave to accept the choice of the electoral committee.[2]

Each of the Popes announced his election to the princes of Christendom, for the purpose of gaining their support. It appeared uncertain for a time which would have the larger following. Great confusion prevailed throughout the Church, bishops of the opposing parties contending for episcopal sees, and rival abbots disputing the headship of monasteries. The party of Anacletus, as we should expect, prevailed in Rome. Innocent withdrew to France, leaving Conrad, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, as his representative in Italy. He was kindly received by Louis VI. (1108-37), who referred the question of the rival claims of him and Anacletus to a council held at Etampes, in 1130. Guided chiefly by the opinion of St. Bernard, who had

Innocent withdraws to France (1130).

---

[1] He had at least twenty-six followers among the cardinals. It is impossible to determine whether the others whose names are signed to the letter announcing his election to Lothaire were cardinals or merely bishops. Milman says (iii. 326) that Innocent was acknowledged by only twenty-six cardinals.

[2] "Dehinc," writes St. Bernard (Ep. 126), "si electiones discutias, nostra ibidem mox occurrit et promotione purior, et ratione probabilior, et prior tempore."

examined the matter most carefully, the fathers declared in favour of Innocent. Their decision was ratified a few months later by the Council of Clermont, at which Innocent was present.

St. Bernard laboured energetically in the cause of union, and wrote to the princes and bishops of Europe in favour of Innocent. He succeeded, in 1131, in winning over to his side Henry I. of England, who showed himself doubtful for some time as to the side he should take. St. Bernard was ably assisted by one who was second only to him in influence, viz., Peter the Venerable of Clugny. The attitude of the latter towards an old colleague was fatal to the prospects of Anacletus. The example of these two illustrious leaders of their age was immediately followed by all the great religious orders. Within two years after his election Innocent was recognised throughout the Christian world with the exception of Rome, Southern Italy, Sicily, and Aquitaine.[1] Anacletus secured Rome through the wealth and influence of his powerful relatives, while he gained over the Normans of Southern Italy and Sicily by bestowing the much-coveted title of king on their Duke Roger, to whom he also gave his niece in marriage. The Duke of Aquitaine adhered to the anti-

Innocent recognised throughout most of Christendom.

---

[1] Scotland is also mentioned by some writers, *v.g.*, Jungmann (v, 62), as siding with the antipope. "But the only authority for this seems to be a passage in *Richard of Hexham*:—'Ille (Scoti) vero . . . exosae memoriae Petro Leoni et apostasiae ejus nimium *favisse videbantur*'—where, with the strongest wish to make out his hated neighbours to have been schismatics, the chronicler does not go so far as to state positively that they were such. On the other hand, the chronicle of Melrose mentions Innocent as the successor of Honorius (A.D. 1130), and records the death of Anacletus thus:—Obiit Petrus Leo *antipapa*; and St. Bernard, as early as 1131, expressly mentions (Ep. 125) Scotland as adhering to Innocent." Rob. v. 83.

pope till 1136, when he was prevailed on by St. Bernard to transfer his allegiance to Innocent.

Innocent left France for Italy early in the year 1132; and, after spending nearly a year in Lombardy he was restored to the possession of Rome by Lothaire II. of Germany (1125-37) on the 30th of April, 1133. The anti-pope withdrew to St. Peter's, where it was not thought worth while to besiege him. Lothaire having promised on oath to defend the person of the Pope, and maintain all the rights of the Holy See, received the imperial crown from the hands of Innocent in the Lateran Church. And the dispute that had been carried on for some time between the Papacy and the Empire regarding the estates of Matilda was amicably settled. It was arranged that they should be held as a fief by Lothaire, and after him by his son-in-law Henry, Duke of Bavaria, on whose death they were to revert to the Holy See.

Restored to Rome (1133).

On Lothaire's departure from Rome, Anacletus regained his former ascendancy in the city. Innocent withdrew to Pisa, accompanied by St. Bernard, who had come to Rome at his request to assist by his prudent advice in the government of the Church. Here he held a numerously-attended council, in May, 1136, at which he excommunicated Anacletus, and pronounced sentence of deposition against his clerical adherents. After an absence of about four years he was again restored to Rome, in 1137, by Lothaire II. The Emperor on this occasion rendered another service to the Pope by checking the pretensions of Roger of Sicily, who had recently invaded some of the Papal possessions in Southern Italy.

He again withdraws from Rome.

Anacletus died suddenly on the 24th January, 1138. His followers elected a successor in the person of Victor IV.

The latter was, however, induced by St. Bernard to submit to Innocent (May 29th, 1138), after a brief reign of a few months. And thus was the schism terminated after it had lasted for over eight years. This happy result was chiefly owing to the exertions of St. Bernard, who, feeling that he was no longer needed in Italy to defend the claims of the rightful Pope, immediately withdrew to his monastic retreat at Clairvaux.

The Schism terminated.

To repair the evils caused by the schism, Innocent II. convoked the eleventh General Council to meet in the Lateran Basilica. In response to the letters of convocation one thousand bishops assembled in Rome from different parts of the Christian world, in the month of April, 1139. Innocent presided; and, in opening the council, delivered an important address on the subjects that were to occupy the attention of the fathers.

Eleventh General Council (1139).

There were thirty canons passed, all disciplinary, except the twenty-third, directed against contemporary heretics who rejected the Real Presence, infant baptism, marriage, and a divinely instituted hierarchy. The clerical adherents of Anacletus were declared deposed from their offices; Roger of Sicily and others refusing to recognise Innocent, excommunicated; the Truce of God enforced; simony, usury, and usurpation of ecclesiastical property condemned; legislation regarding clerical celibacy renewed; and finally, all maliciously striking clerics excommunicated.

Its canons

The remaining years of Innocent's pontificate were disturbed by his wars with the Normans in Southern Italy, and the civil disturbances caused in Rome by Arnold of Brescia.

Roger II. of Sicily (1101-54), having recently invaded

some of the Papal possessions in Southern Italy, subjected the vanquished to the most barbarous treatment, slaughtering defenceless people, plundering churches, and destroying everything that fell into his hands. Innocent, feeling that he was bound to protect his defenceless subjects, led an army to their assistance. But he was defeated and taken prisoner by the Normans (August, 1139). A peace was, however, concluded immediately afterwards between the Pope and the victors, the terms of which were similar to those formerly entered into by Leo. IX. Innocent agreed to confirm the Normans in the possession of Apulia and Calabria, to be held as fiefs of the Holy See, and to recognise the title of king bestowed on Roger by Anacletus. The Pope was forthwith restored to freedom, and returned to Rome.

Relations between Innocent and the Normans

He was scarcely out of one trouble when he found himself involved in another. The Romans, influenced by the republican spirit[1] of the age, and the preaching of Arnold[2]

Republicanism in Rome.

---

[1] Mediæval Republicanism sprang up in Northern Italy, during the latter half of the eleventh century. The great cities of Lombardy, confident in the strength of their rapidly-increasing populations, took advantage of the troubles that agitated Germany to establish their independence and appoint their own forms of government, though they continued to recognise the nominal suzerainty of the German emperors. The efforts of the latter to assert their authority over the Italian Republics, as well as the quarrels among the Republics themselves, made Lombardy the scene of almost continual warfare for over three centuries. (See Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 8th ed., 174.)

[2] Arnold was born at Brescia in Lombardy, about the year 1105. While still young he went to France, and studied under Abelard, who appears to have communicated to his pupil his own daring and restless spirit. On his return to Italy, he was ordained priest, and enrolled among the clergy of his native town. After a short time, however, he allowed himself to be so much carried away by the spirit of his age, that, resigning his ecclesiastical charge, he devoted most of the remaining years of his life to fanning the flame of Republicanism. He directed his attacks principally against the clergy, whom he looked on as the chief conservative forces he

Arnold of Brescia.

of Brescia against the wealth and civil power of the clergy, rose in revolt against the temporal authority of the Pope, and established (1143) a senate on the Capitol after the model of Pagan Rome. Innocent did not survive the shock long; he died in September, 1143. The senate maintained its usurped power till the reign of Hadrian IV. (1154-59), who laid Rome under interdict, and compelled the senators to recognise his authority.

---

had to contend with in the realization of his schemes. He inveighed strongly against their wealth, and advocated a complete separation between the spiritual and temporal powers, the latter being, according to him, incompatible with the former. His views were recommended to the laity as well by his eloquence, described by St. Bernard (Ep. 195) "as smooth as oil, yet cutting as the sword," as by the hope he held out to them of becoming the possessors of the lands then in the hands of ecclesiastics.

He was condemned by the second General Council of Lateran (1139), and sent into exile across the Alps. During his exile he appeared at the Council of Sens (1140) as one of the chief defenders of his old master Abelard. Being denounced to St. Bernard as an avowed enemy of the Church, he fled to Zurich to escape arrest. Here he remained till 1145, when he returned to Italy, and, according to some (Jungmann, v. 83), submitted to Pope Eugene, who allowed him to remain in the country on the condition that he should take no part in any political movement. He kept his engagement till 1147, when, on the departure of Eugene for France, he again stirred up the Romans to recall the little authority in political matters recently conceded by the Republicans to the Holy See. He was at length arrested by Frederick I., during the pontificate of Hadrian IV., and hanged, after which his body was burned, and his ashes cast into the Tiber (1155).

CHAPTER IV.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE HOHENSTAUFENS.[1] FIRST PERIOD.

WITH the accession of Frederick I. to the German throne, in 1152, began what is commonly known in history as the Hundred Years' Struggle between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufens. It was carried on by the former to vindicate the liberties of the Church and her independence of State control, and was but the continuation, under a somewhat different form, of the struggle commenced a hundred years earlier by Hildebrand. The entire contest may, therefore, be said to have extended over two centuries, and has been fittingly compared by Archbishop Trench [2] to a portentous drama of three acts, the first ending with the Concordat of Worms (1122); the second with the Treaty of Venice (1177); and the third, with the final extinction of the House of the Hohenstaufens (1268).

The nature of the struggle.

Frederick I., surnamed Barbarossa, from his red beard, belonged to the ancient and noble family of the Hohenstaufens, that had been first brought into special prominence during the reign of Henry IV. by siding with him in his quarrel with Gregory VII. On the death of his

Frederick Barbarossa.

[1] The German sovereigns, from Conrad III. (1137-52) to Conrad IV. (1250-54), were called Hohenstaufens, from a castle of that name in which their ancestors lived, near Göppingen, in the present kingdom of Würtemburg.

[2] *Lectures on Med. Ch. History*, 170.

uncle, Conrad III., in 1152, he was elected to succeed to the vacant throne. His reign extended over thirty-eight years, during which time eight Popes occupied the Chair of St. Peter, the most prominent being Eugene III. (1145-53), Hadrian IV. (1154-59), and Alexander III. (1159-81). He was a man of boundless ambition, who aimed at attaining the same absolutism as the old Roman Cæsars in Church and State. "He entertained," says Dean Milman,[1] "the loftiest notions of his unlimited supremacy, his absolute independence of, and his temporal superiority over, all other powers, even that of the Pope."

His character understood at Rome.

From the moment that he ascended the throne of Germany his character and aims became known to all. And nowhere were they better understood than at Rome. For we are told[2] that, during the very first year of his reign, he sent an embassy to Eugene III., asking the Pope to co-operate with him in establishing his authority over the whole world. This will explain why his conduct was viewed with such suspicion at Rome, and how matters, apparently trifling in themselves, sometimes led to serious conflicts between him and the Popes. Nor was he devoid of some good qualities—he was favourably known for his bravery in war, his administrative tact, and his literary attainments. But these he too often used to humiliate and oppress the Church.

He violates the Concordat of Worms.

One of his first acts as King of Germany was to violate the Concordat of Worms, by undue interference in the appointment of a bishop to the see of Magdeburg. The

---

[1] *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, iii. 411.

[2] John of Salisbury, who was present in Rome on the occasion, has handed down an account of the conduct and mission of Frederick's representatives. (Ep. lix.)

election being disputed he was bound[1] to refer the matter to a Provincial Synod and abide by its decision. But, instead of doing so, he conferred the dignity on a favourite of his own. For this he was severely censured by Eugene III. Yet his nominee continued to retain the see in open defiance of the Holy See.

Notwithstanding the estrangement which Frederick's flagrant violation of the Concordat of Worms brought about between him and Eugene, they shortly afterwards entered into a treaty, by which the Emperor bound himself to assist in reducing to subjection the Republican party in Rome, and to abstain from entering into any negotiations with the Normans in Italy without the consent of the Holy See; while the Pope promised to bestow the Imperial Crown on him as soon as he could go to Rome. Eugene, however, died before he could carry out his part of the compact, and was succeeded by Anastasius IV. (1153-54). The latter refused at first to recognise Frederick's nominee as Archbishop of Magdeburg; but, after some time, he consented, in the interest of peace, to confirm the appointment.

He enter into a treaty wi Euge

Anastasius was succeeded by Hadrian IV., the only Englishman who has ever occupied the Chair of St. Peter. Nicholas Breakspeare, as he was called before his appoint-

Hadrian IV.

[1] The words of the Concordat are:—"Ego Calixtus, Servus Servorum Dei, tibi dilecto filio Henrico, Dei gratia Romanorum Imperatori Augusto, concedo electiones episcoporum et abbatum Teutonici Regni qui ad regnum pertinent, in praesentia tua fieri absque simonia et aliqua violentia; *ut si qua inter partes discordia emerserit, Metropolitani et provincialium consilio vel judicio, saniori parti assensum et auxilium praebeas.*" (Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vi., p. ii., 1107.) Hence, Robertson (v. 159) is wrong, and those who hold with him, that Frederick was within his right in intruding his favourite into the see because of the disputed election.

ment, was of humble origin, being the son of a poor clerk who attended at the monastery of St. Alban's. He left his native land at an early age in pursuit of knowledge; and, after completing his studies at the University of Paris, entered the Monastery of St. Rufus, near Avignon, of which he was shortly afterwards appointed Abbot. His efforts to restore monastic discipline, which had fallen into decay, brought him into conflict with the monks, who appealed against him to Rome. Eugene III., who was Pope at the time, having heard both sides, showed his appreciation of Breakspeare by inviting him to Rome, and creating him Cardinal Bishop of Albano. He was sent by Eugene on an important mission to the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, from which he did not return till the pontificate of Anastasius. The ability and administrative tact, shown by him on his mission, won for him general esteem; and, on the death of Anastasius, the English exile was deemed worthy to fill the highest office on earth. A contemporary writer, Cardinal Boso, in describing his election, speaks[1] of him as "a man remarkable for his kindness, meekness, and patience, skilled in the English and Latin tongues; ready in conversation; a polished speaker; a distinguished preacher; slow to get angry; ready to pardon; bountiful in alms, and renowned for his stainless character."

His character.

One of his first acts after his elevation to the Papacy was to place Rome under interdict for the purpose of checking the growing insolence of the Republicans, who went so far on one occasion as to attack a cardinal in the public streets, inflicting on him a mortal wound. By this strong measure

Compels the Romans to recognise his authority.

[1] Watterich, *Vitae Pontif. Rom.*, ii. 324.

—the first instance on record of the Eternal City being deprived of the public offices of religion—the Romans were compelled to dissociate themselves from Arnold of Brescia and recognise the civil authority of the Pope.

Towards the end of the year 1154, Frederick crossed the Alps at the head of a large army. After subduing some of the Lombard cities, that had recently thrown off his yoke, he was crowned with the Iron Crown[1] of Lombardy at Pavia, on the 17th April, 1155. He then set out for Rome to receive the Imperial Crown from the Pope. Hadrian, suspecting his ulterior designs, withdrew from the city at his approach. Being assured by messengers from Frederick that both himself and the cardinals would be safe, he set out for Sutri to meet the King. Here the first difficulty arose regarding the ceremony of the Pope's reception, trivial in itself, but significant of the suspicion with which the conduct of each was viewed by the other. Frederick refused to hold the stirrup of the Pope when dismounting from his horse, though he was required to do so by custom and the law[2] of the German Empire, whereupon the Pope refused to give him the usual kiss of peace. It being represented, however, to him by some of his followers that he was obliged both by custom and law to hold the Pope's stirrup, he yielded, and was admitted to the kiss of peace. They then proceeded to Rome where Frederick was crowned emperor in St. Peter's, on the 15th of June, 1155. Frederick shortly afterwards returned to Germany.

Frederick crosses the Alps (1154).

Misunderstanding between him and Hadrian.

[1] It is preserved in the Cathedral of Monza, to which it was presented by the Lombard Queen Theodolinda († 628). It consists of a diadem of gold and jewels, within which is a thin circle of iron—hence the name of the crown—said to have been formed out of one of the nails of the cross.

[2] *v.g.*, *The Swabian Mirror* says, "When he (the Pope) mounts his white charger, the emperor shall hold his stirrup."

It was not long till a more serious cause of quarrel occurred between Hadrian and Frederick. On the death of Roger II. of Sicily, in 1154, his son William I. (1154-66) assumed the title of king, without reference to his feudal lord, the Pope. The latter wrote to him a letter of remonstrance, addressing him merely as lord of Sicily. William retaliated, by invading the Papal possessions in Southern Italy, and laying siege to Benevento, in which Hadrian had taken refuge. The city being unable to hold out against the Norman army, the Pope was obliged to come to terms with the victors (June 1156). He agreed to recognise William as King of Sicily and Duke of Apulia; the latter, on his part, having consented to receive his possessions as fiefs of the Holy See, and to pay a yearly tribute for them. Frederick, on hearing of this treaty, felt much incensed, as he had been for some time meditating the conquest of Southern Italy and Sicily, and openly charged Hadrian with having violated the Concordat entered into between himself and Eugene III. For this charge there was not the slightest foundation, as the Emperor alone was forbidden to enter into any negotiations with the Normans, who were vassals of the Holy See. Frederick, however, showed his displeasure at the Pope's action by intruding many of his own favourites into bishoprics and other rich benefices.

The Quarrel between Pope and Emperor regarding Sicily.

The Pope could not allow such conduct to pass unnoticed. He sent envoys to Frederick to complain of his open violation of the Concordat of Worms, and of his negligence in securing the release of Eskyl, Archbishop of Lund, in Sweden, who, on his way back from Rome, had been made prisoner by some German knights. The Papal envoys brought with them a letter in which Hadrian, in enumerating the favours he had bestowed on Frederick,

Papal legates sent to complain of Frede ck's conduc

spoke of his coronation as a *beneficium*. Some of the Emperor's followers, understanding the term in its feudal sense—a meaning excluded by the context—charged the Pope with an attempt to make the empire a fief of the Holy See. Nor did the envoys contribute by their conduct to remove the erroneous construction put on the Pope's letter; for one of them asked indignantly, from whom he held the empire, if not from the Pope. Whereupon they were instantly dismissed from the royal presence, and commanded to leave Germany without delay. Moreover, intercourse between the Pope and German bishops was strictly interdicted, and appeals to Rome forbidden. When Hadrian heard what had occurred, he wrote to Frederick, disowning the construction put on his previous letter, and explaining that the word *beneficium* meant merely an act of kindness, and not a fief. The Emperor pretended to be satisfied with the explanation; and thus was the storm which was fast gathering prevented from breaking for the present.

Frederick crosses the Alps a second time (1158).

The rebellion of the Lombard republics led Frederick across the Alps a second time, in 1158, at the head of 120,000 men. After inflicting signal vengeance on Milan, the head of the Republican Confederation, he held an assembly of jurisconsults on the plain of Roncaglia, to formulate his legal rights over his subjects. These obsequious creatures, acting on their master's instructions, declared that he, as successor to the old Roman emperors, inherited their absolute authority in enacting laws and imposing taxes. Frederick immediately set about reducing the principles of the jurisconsults to practice. He took away most of the rights previously enjoyed by the Lombard republics; oppressed his subjects by heavy taxes; claimed

EX LIBRIS PROVINCIAE
PRO STUDIIS THEOL.
S.S. CORDIS IESU.

supreme civil authority in Rome; conferred the estates of Matilda on one of his followers; insulted the Pope, by giving his own name precedence in all public documents; and violated the Concordat of Worms by intruding his favourites into vacant sees.[1]

Hadrian sent an embassy of five cardinals to the Emperor, to protest, in the most solemn manner, against his arrogance and his disgraceful violation of the Church's rights and liberties. This mission, instead of effecting a change in Frederick, appears to have made him more aggressive. He was about to march on Rome to assert his authority in the City of the Popes, when Hadrian, being made aware of his intention, withdrew to Anagni. Here, acting on the advice of most of the cardinals, he was preparing to excommunicate Frederick, when he died,[2] on the 1st of September, 1159. "Thus ended," says Dean Milman,[3] "the poor English scholar at open war with, perhaps, the mightiest sovereign who had reigned in Transalpine Europe since the days of Charlemagne."

Death of Hadrian (1159).

Alexander III. (1159-81).

The election[4] of a successor to Hadrian IV. gave rise to a fresh schism, which continued for nearly a quarter of a century. The cardinals, who were mostly in favour of the policy of the late Pope, though some few sided with the Emperor, went into conclave in St. Peter's, on the 5th of September; and two days later all, except three, gave their

---

[1] Jungmann, v. 117.

[2] His remains were brought to Rome and interred in St. Peter's with the highest honours.

[3] *Lat. Christianity*, iii. 426.

[4] The particulars of the election are fully described by Alexander III. in the letters addressed by him to the chief bishops of Christendom announcing his appointment.

votes to Cardinal Roland,[1] who was proclaimed Pope under the name of Alexander III. The three dissenting cardinals, refusing to accept the choice of the majority, elected Cardinal Octavian, one of their own body, who took the name of Victor IV. The schismatical faction was shortly afterwards joined by three additional cardinals, for the names of five[2] appear in the letter addressed by Victor to the Christian world.

Election of an antipope.

The argument urged by the antipope against the validity of Alexander's election, was that the cardinals bound themselves by oath before leaving Anagni not to accept anyone who was not unanimously appointed. No such compact is referred to by Alexander in any of the letters written by him describing the circumstances of his election. For this as well as for other reasons, it is rejected as fictitious by most writers. But, even if the alleged compact had been entered into by the cardinals, it is obvious that they did not intend to require unanimity as essential to a valid election. For such an agreement would be unreasonable; and, therefore, invalid in the sight of God.

Argument urged against Alexander's election.

Alexander was consecrated at Ninfa by the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, on the 20th September; and the antipope, at Farfa, on the 4th October, by the Bishop of Tusculum. Frederick, to whom each had written to announce his election, feigning strict impartiality, convoked a council to meet at Pavia in October, 1159, to decide between the rival claimants to the Papacy. The character of his

Frederick undertakes to heal the schism.

---

[1] Also called Orlando. For the different names by which he was known, see Ciaconius, *Vitae et Res Gestae Pontif. Rom.* (Rome, 1677), vol. i., page 1043.

[2] Twenty-two cardinals signed the letter addressed by Alexander to the Emperor.

impartiality was made sufficiently manifest by the way in which he addressed Alexander and Victor, in inviting them to attend the council. While the former was addressed as Cardinal Roland, the latter was styled Victor, Bishop of Rome.

The council did not meet till February, 1160. Alexander refused to attend the imperial conventicle; but he was represented by a cardinal, who was instructed to effect a reconciliation, if possible, between the Holy See and the schismatics. Victor attended, as he felt confident of the result of the council. Bishops had been invited from every part of the world to give the conventicle the appearance of an Ecumenical Council. But only fifty[1] bishops from Germany and Lombardy put in an appearance, all of whom were in the imperial interests. The decision was, as anticipated, in favour of Victor, who proceeded forthwith to pronounce sentence of excommunication against Alexander and his adherents. Frederick sought to give effect to the decision of the council by ordering his subjects to obey Victor as the lawful Pope. He also endeavoured to involve other countries in the schism; but in this he was unsuccessful, as the whole Christian world outside Germany yielded allegiance to Alexander III.

Council of Pavia (1160).

Alexander withdrew from Rome shortly after his appointment, and fixed his residence at Anagni. Here he held a synod in March, 1160, in which he excommunicated Victor, Frederick, and their adherents. On hearing that Milan had been taken (March, 1162) by Frederick, after a

[1] The names of one hundred and fifty-three bishops were signed to the synodical letter forwarded by the emperor to the bishops of Christendom, announcing the decision of the council. But we are told by contemporary writers, that most of the signatures were forged. See Jungmann, v. 130.

prolonged siege of three years, its walls being razed to the ground, its houses destroyed, and its citizens sent into exile,[1] and that Lombardy had been completely subdued, he withdrew to France, to avoid falling into the hands of his enemies. On his arrival at Montpellier, in April, 1162, he was received with the greatest enthusiasm. He was met at Toucy on the Loire by the kings of France and England, who appeared for the time to forget their rivalry in paying honour to the Father of the Faithful. They walked on either side of his horse, holding the bridle, and so conducted him into the town.

Alexander withdraws to France (1162).

An important council was held at Tours, in 1163, at which there attended, in addition to the Pope, seventeen cardinals and one hundred and twenty-four bishops from France, Italy, and England. Numerous disciplinary enactments were passed for the better government of the Church, and the orders conferred by Victor were declared unlawful. Alexander was invited by the kings of France and England to fix his residence in any town in their dominions. He selected Sens, where he remained for nearly two years.

Council of Tours (1163).

The antipope died at Lucca, in 1164, and was succeeded by one of the two surviving schismatical Cardinals named Guido of Crema, who took the name of Paschal III. (1164-68). The emperor endeavoured to gain over Henry II. of England, who was at the time engaged in a heated controversy with St. Thomas à Becket, while Paschal

Frederick's efforts to involve England and France in the schism.

[1] Among the spoils carried off were the relics of the Three Kings, said to have been presented to Eustorgius, Archbishop of Milan, by St. Helena. They were given to the Archbishop of Cologne, who transferred them to his own cathedral, where they are at present.

sought to influence French sentiment in his favour by authorizing the Archbishop of Cologne to place Charlemagne's name on the Calendar of the Saints. The efforts, however, of Frederick and his antipope were equally unsuccessful.

A league was formed in 1165, by the chief cities of Northern Italy for mutual self-defence against the tyranny of the Emperor. Relying on its strength, Alexander returned to Rome towards the end of the same year (Nov. 21st), at the urgent request of the citizens. "His reception was a scene of extraordinary enthusiasm. The senate, the nobles, the clergy, and a vast multitude of people, bearing olive branches in their hands, pressed forth to meet him, and conducted him to the city with the liveliest demonstrations of joy."[1] He shortly afterwards entered into an alliance with the Lombard Confederation and the King of Sicily against the Emperor.

Lombard Confederation (1165).

Frederick crosses the Alps a third time (1167).

Frederick crossed the Alps, for the third time, at the head of a large army, early in 1167, determined to have revenge on the Lombards and the Pope. Having reduced the former to subjection, he marched towards Rome and succeeded in getting possession of a part of the city, after a brief resistance. He had the antipope enthroned in St. Peter's, and received from his hands the Imperial Crown (August 1st). Alexander had taken refuge in the Castle of St. Angelo. But finding it unsafe to remain there, he fled, in the garb of a pilgrim, at first to Gaeta, and afterwards to Benevento, whither the Cardinals followed him. Here he held a synod, in which he renewed

[1] Rob., v. 189.

the sentence of excommunication against Frederick, and released his subjects from their oaths of allegiance.[1]

The impious and tyrannical extravagance of Frederick had reached its height; the cup of his iniquity had been filled. Henceforth, Nemesis was on his track. Disaster after disaster overtook him, till he was, at last, compelled to submit to the power against which he had battled so long. On the day following his coronation by the antipope, a terrible plague broke out among his followers, which carried them off by thousands. "Never," says Milman,[2] "did the climate of Rome so fearfully humiliate the pride of an emperor, or work with such awful force for the liberation of Italy. No wonder that the visible hand of God was seen in the epidemic which visited the German army. It seemed commissioned with special violence against those rebellious churchmen who had taken part and stood in arms against the lawful Pope . . . The pestilence was no less terrific from its rapidity than from its intensity. Men who were in perfect health in the morning were dead before evening: it was hardly possible to perform the rites of decent burial." Being obliged, owing to the continuance of the plague, to leave Rome, he directed his steps northwards; but only to find that the Lombard League had been rehabilitated and strengthened by the addition of other cities. Being unable with his diminished forces to meet the confederates, he was obliged to return (March, 1168) to Germany, accompanied by only a small remnant of the magnificent army he had led into Italy.

His soldiers attacked by a plague in Rome.

He returns to Germany (1168).

---

[1] John of Salisbury, Ep. 184.

[2] *Lat. Christianity*, iii. 533.

On the death of Paschal III., a few months later, as no cardinal of the schismatical faction survived, his adherents elected, as successor, John, Abbot of Struma, under the name of Calixtus III. (1168-78).

Alexander III., who was now the recognised head of the Lombard League, renewed his alliance with the new King of Sicily, William II. (1166-89). He impressed strongly on the Italians the necessity of making elaborate preparations to defend their lives and liberties against Frederick, who had vowed to wipe out, as soon as possible, his recent disgrace. A strongly fortified city was built (1168) by the Lombards, at the confluence of the Tanaro and the Bermida, which was called Alexandria, in honour of the Pope. It was peopled mostly by those who had been exiled by Frederick from Milan and other cities, and could boast, within a year after its foundation, of having fifteen thousand fighting men within its walls.

The new city of Alexandria.

Having spent about seven years in collecting the forces deemed necessary to reverse the result of his last Italian expedition, Frederick crossed the Alps for the fourth time, in 1174, at the head of a magnificent army. Shortly after his arrival in Lombardy, he laid siege to Alexandria. Having sat in vain before its walls for five months he was obliged to raise the siege at the approach of the Confederate troops, and withdrew to Legnano. Here the two armies met on the 29th of May, 1176. The Imperial forces were totally routed, and Frederick himself narrowly escaped with his life. The overwhelming defeat brought the Emperor to his senses. Negotiations were opened between him and Alexander, which ended in the Treaty[1] of

Frederick crosses the Alps for the fourth time (1174)

Battle of Legnano (1176).

[1] Hard., *Col. Conc.* vi., pt. ii., 1654.

Venice (1177), so called from the place where it was concluded. Alexander was acknowledged as lawful Pope; Calixtus[1] was to be restored to his former office of Abbot; those who joined the schism were to be absolved on their expressing regret for the past; a truce of fifteen years was concluded by the Emperor with the King of Sicily, and one of six years[2] with the Lombard League; and, finally, the Emperor was to enjoy the estates of Matilda for fifteen years, after which they were to revert[3] to the Holy See. Thus ended the first period of the struggle between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufens. Treaty of Venice (1177).

The last great event of Alexander's pontificate was the celebration of the third General Council of Lateran. It was opened by the Pope in person, in the month of March, 1179. There were present three hundred and two bishops[4] and about seven hundred abbots and priests. There were three General Sessions held, at which the Pope presided. The fathers passed twenty seven canons,[5] the most noteworthy being the first and last. The former, The eleventh General Council (1179).

---

[1] Calixtus held out till August, 1178, when he submitted to Alexander. Some of his followers elected (1179) a successor in the person of Innocent III. The latter, however, was taken prisoner, in 1170, and sentenced to confinement in a monastery.

[2] When the term of this truce was approaching, a permanent treaty was concluded between Frederick and the Lombards at Constance, in 1183, by which the former consented to abandon most of the rights claimed for him by the jurisconsults of Roncaglia, and to recognise the Italian republics as placed on an equal footing with the chief vassals of the crown. This treaty left Frederick little more than a titular supremacy over the Lombard towns. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 178.

[3] Baronius, *Annales*, Ad an. 1177.

[4] Among them were St. Laurence O'Toole of Dublin, Catholicus of Tuam, and six other bishops from Ireland. Baronius, Ad an. 1178.

[5] Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vi., pt. ii., 1683.

suggested by what had occurred on the occasion of Alexander's elevation, required for the valid election of a Pope, the votes of two-thirds of the cardinals. The latter condemned certain sectaries that were very numerous in the north of Italy and the south of France, some of whom were satisfied with proclaiming their heresy in public, while others committed various excesses after the manner of pagans, destroying monasteries and churches, and respecting neither age nor sex. The council merely excommunicated the former; but it advised Christians to unite against the latter, and repel force by force, a plenary indulgence being granted to all who would join in the crusade against them. Of the other canons the principal were—the second, condemning orders conferred by schismatics; the third, fixing thirty as the canonical age for the episcopate; the fourth, requiring clerics to have some means of support before being promoted to Holy Orders; the twelfth, forbidding ecclesiastical cases to be brought before lay tribunals; and the thirteenth, condemning a plurality of benefices.

Its canons.

Alexander's well-known determination and energy of character were sufficient to secure the observance of the Peace of Venice during his lifetime. But, after his death, Frederick began to show signs of resuming his old policy of aggression towards the Papacy. He asked Alexander's successor, Lucius III. (1181-85) to bestow the Imperial Crown, on his son, Henry, to ensure his succession to the throne. With this request Lucius refused to comply, as there could not be two emperors at the same time. Frederick succeeded, in 1186, in bringing about a marriage between his son and Constance, the aunt and heiress of William II. of Sicily, for the purpose of securing for his own house the

Relations between Frederick and Alexander's successors.

Norman possessions in Italy and Sicily. To this Urban III. (1185-87) the successor of Lucius, was strongly opposed, as he felt that the union of the two crowns on the head of a Hohenstaufen would be injurious to the liberty and independence of the Holy See. He shortly afterwards gave Urban more cause for complaint by having Henry crowned with the Iron Crown of Lombardy, at Milan, by the Patriarch of Aquileia. This being a violation of the rights of Urban III., who was also Archbishop of Milan,[1] drew on the head of the offending patriarch the sentence of excommunication. Frederick further showed his anxiety to renew the quarrel with the Holy See by usurping the revenues of vacant sees, and conferring bishoprics on his favourites. Urban was preparing to excommunicate him, when he died at Ferrara, in 1187.

Urban's two immediate successors, viz., Gregory VIII., who reigned only a few months, and Clement III. (1187-91), were naturally averse to disputes of all kinds; and manifested a greater desire to assist the Christians in the Holy Land than to defend the liberties of the Church and the privileges of the Holy See. Their conciliatory policy averted the threatened renewal of the quarrel between the Papacy and the empire. Though Frederick had shown that he was animated with no kind or generous feelings towards the Church, still, yielding to the crusading enthusiasm of the age, he set out in 1189 with a large army to assist the Eastern Christians against the Saracens, and met with his death in the following year from a chill caught while bathing in the river Selef, in Asia Minor.

Death of Frederick I (1190)

[1] Urban had been Archbishop of Milan before his elevation to the Papacy. He continued to retain the see, after his elevation, to prevent the intrusion into it of a nominee of the Emperor.

Henry VI. (1190-7)

Frederick's successor, Henry VI. (1190-97), showed immediately after his accession to the throne that he had inherited the wickedness of the Hohenstaufens. He openly violated the Concordat of Worms by the sale of benefices and the intrusion of his own friends into vacant sees. And, on the death of Tancred of Sicily (1189-94), the successor of William II., he led an army into Italy; and, to the utter disregard of the rights of the Holy See, made good his claims to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies,[1] which he ruled as a tyrant. Clergy and nobles were put to death or barbarously mutilated; Tancred's son, after being deprived of his sight, was shut up in a castle to die; and his wife and sisters were subjected to various indignities in German prisons.[2] But, fortunately for the peace of the Church and the interests of Christendom, Henry died suddenly, in 1197, from drinking cold water when heated by riding.

His character.

[1] Sicily and Southern Italy were frequently styled the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

[2] Rob. v. 240.

CHAPTER V.

THE PONTIFICATE OF INNOCENT III. (1198-1216).

It was during the pontificate of Innocent III. that the sway of the Popes reached its culminating point, and the principles of ecclesiastical government laid down by the illustrious Hildebrand approached nearest their realisation. Thus, while the Papacy was recognised as the arbiter of disputes between nations and the supreme court, to which the monarch as well as the subject were obliged to submit; the Church was free and independent, her influence dominated human society, and her Gospel formed the basis of every Christian constitution. For this happy condition of things Gregory VII., and many of his successors, prepared the way. But the triumph of the cause for which they had struggled required the energy and administrative tact of Innocent III., one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of the Church's rulers.

Condition of the Papacy during the reign of Innocent III.

Lothaire—the name by which he was known before he became Pope—belonged to the noble Italian family of the Conti,[1] and was born at Anagni, in 1161. He possessed rare intellectual gifts which he carefully cultivated by a long course of study in Rome, Paris, and Bologna. On his return to Rome, he was ordained (1187) sub-deacon by Gregory VIII. It was not long till his learning and irreproachable character won for him general esteem; and, on the elevation

His early life

[1] So called from their having been the Counts of Segni.

of his uncle, Clement III., to the Papal Chair, he was raised to the dignity of the Cardinalate. On the accession, however, of Celestine III., he was deprived of his offices in the Church, owing, it is supposed, to a quarrel between their families. He withdrew from Rome, and spent the time of his retirement in perfecting his knowledge of theology and canon law, and writing useful works, the chief being *On the Contempt of the World*, and *On the Sacrifice of the Mass*.

His elevation to the Papacy (1198).

On the death of Celestine, in 1198, Cardinal Lothaire was unanimously elected to fill the vacant office, though he was the youngest member of the Sacred College, being only thirty-seven years of age. After some hesitation, he consented to accept the dignity; and, having received the orders of the priesthood and the episcopate, he was crowned Pope, under the name of Innocent III., the title by which he had been saluted by the cardinals on the occasion of his election, in testimony of his blameless life.

Condition of the Christian world at the time.

At the time of his accession to the Papal throne, the condition of the Christian world was by no means encouraging. "Wherever he cast his eyes over Christendom, and beyond the limits of Christendom, appeared disorder, contested thrones, sovereigns oppressing their subjects, subjects in arms against their sovereigns, the ruin of the Christian cause. In Italy, the crown of Naples on the head of an infant; the fairest provinces under the galling yoke of fierce German adventurers; the Lombard republics, Guelf and Ghibelline[1] at war within their walls, and at war or in

[1] Guelfs and Ghibellines are the names by which the Papal and Imperialist factions were known in Germany and Italy from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. The origin of the titles has given rise to considerable controversy. It appears most probable that they are the Italianized forms of the names of

implacable animosity against each other; the empire distracted by rival claimants for the throne, one vast scene of battle, intrigue, almost of anarchy; the tyrannical and dissolute Philip Augustus of France, before long the tyrannical and feeble John of England. The Byzantine empire was tottering to its fall, the kingdom of Jerusalem confined almost to the city of Acre. Every realm seemed to demand, or at least to invite, the interposition and mediation of the Head of Christendom." [1] The need of the beneficent influence of religion and of a great Pope to direct and energize the Church was everywhere felt. Fortunately for the interests of Christianity and European civilization, God gave to His Church a ruler equal to the requirements of the time in the person of the illustrious Lothaire.

Like every true pastor who is really earnest in the work of reformation, he was careful to mould his own life according to the teaching of the Gospel, and thus gave Christians a model which they might imitate. He also showed his true reformatory spirit in the management of the Papal household, by putting an end to some abuses that had recently made their appearance there. He drew up a scale of fees for the officials, remarkable for their moderation; dismissed a large number of noblemen who frequented the palace; and ordered that free access should

Innocent's reformatory zeal.

---

two German families, Welf and Waiblingen, that came by degrees to be applied to all who embraced their principles. They were originally opposed to each other on the question of the relation between the Papacy and the empire; but their opposition soon extended to other points. The names appear to have been first used in their party sense at the battle of Weinsberg, in Suabia, fought in 1140, between the Emperor Conrad and Welf, the uncle Henry the Lion of Saxony. See Palma, *Prael. in Hist. Ecclesiasticam*, ii. 342, Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicae*. Dissert. li.
Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iv. 12.

be given all who wished to see him. His decisions on legal questions referred to him were greatly admired for their clearness and equity by the lawyers who used to frequent his court; while his sermons have been always highly esteemed as models of pulpit eloquence.

His Government of the Papal States.

His government of the Papal States was most successful. He compelled the Prefect of Rome to acknowledge his authority and take the oath of allegiance. Justiciaries were appointed who were to hold office at his pleasure, and were responsible to him alone for the administration of the law. His peaceful rule in Rome was interrupted once for a brief period, in 1203, when he withdrew to Anagni, owing to a disagreement with the Senate regarding a piece of land. With the assistance of the Lombard league he compelled the German mercenaries, who were in possession of most of the Papal States up to the very walls of Rome, to restore the confiscated possessions, or acknowledge the suzerainty of the Pope. The Italians were most willing to co-operate with Innocent against the Germans, as the cruelties practised by Henry VI. were yet fresh in their memories.

The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies engages his attention.

The condition of affairs in Southern Italy and Sicily engaged Innocent's attention immediately after his election. At the request of Constance, the queen regent of the Two Sicilies, he bestowed investiture of that kingdom on her youthful son, Frederick II., having previously required him to relinquish the ecclesiastical privileges known as the Sicilian Monarchy[1] wrung from his predecessors by some

[1] The claim of the rulers of Sicily to ecclesiastical authority in that island was based on a grant made by Urban II. to Roger I. (†1101). The latter, who was a brother of Robert Guiscard, invaded Sicily, in 1060, and, after a war extending over thirty years, overthrew the Saracen power in the island.

of the rulers of Sicily, and to undertake to pay regularly the stipulated tribute to the Holy See. And to render his succession more secure, she appointed Innocent his guardian shortly before her death (27th of November, 1198). Nor was the confidence of Constance misplaced. The Pope discharged his trust with fidelity, providing for the youthful Frederick a suitable education, and watching carefully over his possessions in Italy and Sicily.

His relations with Germany

No part of Christendom occupied the attention of Innocent so much as Germany. This was owing to the struggle carried on in that country between the rival claimants to the crown vacated by the death of Henry VI. The latter had endeavoured to secure the succession of his son, Frederick II., by obliging the princes of Germany

---

He laboured zealously in the interests of Christianity, built numerous churches and monasteries, and founded many bishoprics.

Urban II. having occasion to send a legate to Sicily, in 1098, Roger took offence at his action, as if it showed a want of confidence in his integrity, and refused to recognise the legate. We are told by Malaterra, a contemporary writer, in his *History of Sicily* (lib. iv.), that the difficulty was settled at a meeting held between the Pope and Roger at Salerno. Urban conferred on Roger, in consideration of his labours in the interests of religion, certain legatine powers thus described in the grant (Baronius, Ad an. 1097):—"... literarum auctoritate nos (Urbanus) firmamus quod omni vitae tuae tempore vel filii tui Simonis, aut alterius qui legitimus tuus haeres exstiterit, nullum in terra potestatis vestrae praeter voluntatem aut consilium vestrum legatum Romanae Ecclesiae statuemus; quin imo quae per legatum acturi sumus, per vestram industriam legati vice exhiberi volumus, quando ad vos ex latere nostro miserimus ... Si vero celebrabitur concilium et tibi mandavero, quatenus episcopos et abbates tuae terrae mihi mittas, quot et quos volueris mittas, alios vero ad servitium ecclesiarum et tutelam retineas ..."

The privileges bestowed on "Roger and his son, or other heir," by this grant were, that they should be legates in Sicily; that no legate should enter Sicily without their consent; and that they should determine what bishops were to attend councils held outside Sicily.

The authenticity of this grant has been much disputed, Baronius and others

to swear allegiance to him[1] as their future king (1196). Henry's premature death, however, wrought a great change in the prospects of his youthful son. The electoral princes maintained that they were not bound by their oath, both because they had not been free in taking it, and because the interests of the country required an energetic ruler. So they resolved to set Frederick's claims aside, and elect a new king.

Dispute about the election of a king.

Unfortunately for the peace of Germany, they could not agree in the choice of a candidate. The princes of Eastern Germany, who were in the majority, met at Arnstadt, near Erfurt, and elected Philip, Duke of Swabia,

---

maintaining that it was either forged or substantially mutilated in the interests of the Sicilian rulers. All doubt on the subject is now removed by a document recently discovered in the Vatican archives containing a confirmation of Urban's grant by Paschal II. The latter, while admitting the privileges conferred on Roger I., explains the limits within which they were available for Roger II., who appeared inclined to usurp new powers. Paschal's brief shows that the Holy See never recognised the Sicilian rulers as legates enjoying ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but only in the sense that they were entrusted with the execution of Papal decrees in Sicily, and possessed a right of veto in certain ecclesiastical affairs.

The rights of the Sicilian Monarchy began to attract considerable attention during the sixteenth century, when Sicily came into the hands of the Spanish monarchs through the King of Aragon. They laid claim to extravagant powers over the Sicilian Church in virtue of Urban's grant to Count Roger. This led to serious disputes between them and the Holy See. At length Clement XI. issued a Bull, in 1714, withdrawing all the special privileges in ecclesiastical affairs claimed by the Spanish monarchs. The publication of the Bull caused such general dissatisfaction in Spain, that Benedict XIII. (1724-30) issued a second Bull modifying that of Clement, and granting to an official of the Spanish Crown, called the Judge of the Monarchy, limited authority in the ecclesiastical affairs of Sicily. This new office, and all privileges attached to it, were finally abolished by Pius IX. in 1864.

[1] He was only two years of age at the time, and had not yet been baptized.

brother of the late Emperor: while those of Western Germany gave their suffrages to Otho, son of Henry the Lion of Saxony, who was connected, through his mother, with Richard of England. Otho was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, by the Archbishop of Cologne, on the 12th of July, 1198; and his rival, two months later at Mentz, by the Bishop of Tarentaise, in Savoy. The principle[1] of the majority binding the minority not being yet recognised in German elections, a civil war ensued which continued to devastate Germany for a period of ten years.

Philip and Otho.

Each of the claimants announced his election to Innocent, and endeavoured to secure the Pope's influence in his favour. Innocent expressed his unwillingness to interfere at all in the dispute, and appealed to the electors to settle it among themselves. Most of the clergy took the side of Otho, because of their opposition to the Hohenstaufens, and the general belief that Philip had not been released[2] from the censure of excommunication he had incurred during the pontificate of Celestine III., for having invaded the Papal States.

When Innocent heard of the miseries from which Germany was suffering, he renewed his appeal to the electors to come to an agreement among themselves about a suitable candidate for the vacant crown, and threatened that otherwise he would himself authoritatively interfere and give Germany a ruler. Philip's followers, believing that

Innocent endeavours to settle the dispute.

---

[1] This was not definitely fixed till the Golden Bull of Charles IV., issued in 1536. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 230.

[2] The Bishop of Sutri was sent by Innocent III., in 1198, to absolve him, in case he was prepared to comply with certain conditions. But it appears that the sentence of absolution was pronounced without his being required to comply with the prescribed conditions. Hence the general belief that he was still under the ban of excommunication.

the Pope would not be in favour of their choice, protested strongly against his interference in the affairs of their country as unwarranted. This elicited (1199) a reply from Innocent, known as the *Deliberation*. In it he defends his action in regard to Germany, and examines the claims of the two chief aspirants to the crown, as well as of Frederick II. whose name was suggested by some as a way out of the difficulty. Without undertaking to pass final judgment on the question in dispute, he gave his opinion in favour of Otho, as Frederick was too young, and the traditional policy of Philip's house was opposed to the Church. The receipt of the *Deliberation* in Germany aroused the indignation of Philip's followers, who indulged freely in abuse of the Pope, and prosecuted the war with renewed energy.

The *Deliberation* (1199)

Innocent, finding that his conduct was the subject of much misrepresentation, addressed a long letter, in 1202, to the Duke of Zaringia, a part of which is embodied in Canon Law under the name of the Decretal *Venerabilem*. In it he explains fully the relations of the Holy See to the election of a German sovereign. (*a*) The electoral princes were declared to be perfectly free in their choice of a king. (*b*) They were also declared to be free in the selection of a candidate for the Imperial Crown. But, (*c*), in the latter case, it was defined to be the right of the Pope to accept or reject their selection. And (*d*), in case the electors could not agree among themselves, it was decided that the Pope could authoritatively interfere and settle the dispute.[1] Applying this last principle to

The Decretal *Venerabilem* (1202).

[1] "Numquid enim si principes admoniti et expectati, vel si non potuerint vel voluerint convenire, Apostolica Sedes advocato et defensore carebit, eorumque culpa ipsi redundabit in paenam. Sciunt autem principes, et tua nobilitas non ignorat quod cum Lotharius et Conradus in discordia fuissent electi, Romanus Pontifex Lotharium coronavit, et imperium coronatus obtinuit." Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1201.

the quarrel then raging, Innocent declared Otho King of Germany.

Innocent's open declaration in favour of Otho did not put an end to the civil war. It seemed rather to add to the energy of Philip's followers in upholding the claims of their chief. Victory inclined at first to the side of Otho; but, after 1204, it declared in favour of Philip. The Pope, who still continued to labour in the interests of peace succeeded in bringing about a year's truce in 1207. Representatives of Otho and Philip were sent to Rome to plead their cases before the Holy See. As each refused to yield any of his claims, it soon became clear that peace by compromise was hopeless. Both sides turned their attention, forthwith, to preparing for the final struggle that was to decide the quarrel between them. But before the expiration of the truce, the quarrel was settled in 1208, by the murder of Philip by the Count Palatine, Otho of Wittlesbach, on account of some private feud.

A truce agreed to by Philip and Otho (1207).

Death of Philip (1208).

Otho, being now without a rival, engaged to marry the daughter of Philip, and thus gained over to his side most of his former opponents. He was declared King of Germany at a Diet of Princes, held at Spires in 1209. Towards the end of the same year he was crowned emperor in St. Peter's, having previously promised to respect the laws of the Church, to protect the rights of the Holy See, and to recognise its suzerainty over the Two Sicilies. He had scarcely, however, received the object of his ambition, when he began to violate his promises by confiscating ecclesiastical property, claiming authority over the estates of Matilda, and sending an army into Southern Italy to establish his authority over the Two Sicilies.

Otho crowned emperor (1209).

Violates the rights of the Church.

Innocent wrote to Otho reminding him of his promises, and warning him to desist from his course of hostility to the Holy See. The Emperor replied by telling the Pope to confine himself to his own sphere, and not to interfere in temporal matters in which he had no authority. Innocent having made numerous efforts in vain to bring about a change in Otho's conduct, was at last obliged to excommunicate him in 1211. At the Diet of Nuremberg, held shortly afterwards, the electors, acting on the recommendation of the Pope, gave their votes to Frederick II., who was accordingly declared King of Germany. The struggle which ensued between Otho[1] and Frederick was of brief duration. The arrogance of the former having alienated most of his followers, he was obliged to retire to his hereditary estates. Frederick was crowned king at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1215, having previously promised to cede the Kingdom of the two Sicilies to his son Henry, as soon as he should obtain the Imperial Crown.

His excommunication (1211).

Frederick II. crowned king (1215).

Innocent's quarrel with Philip of France.

Innocent was forced to engage in a quarrel with Philip Augustus of France (1180-1223) in defence of the stability of marriage. Philip's first wife having died, in 1190, he proposed for Ingeburga, sister of the King of Denmark, who was highly esteemed for her beauty and many virtues. His proposal having been accepted, the marriage was celebrated with great pomp at Amiens, on the 14th of August, 1193. As the ceremony of her coronation was being performed on the following day, the King was

[1] He sought to strengthen his cause by marrying the daughter of Philip on the 7th of August, 1212. But her death, four days later, generally ascribed to poisoning, was fatal to his prospects. He died in 1218, having been previously reconciled to the Church.

observed to tremble, indicating thereby, as those present understood, an insuperable aversion to his royal consort. The sudden change in his feelings was generally ascribed at the time to sorcery.[1]

Philip seeks a divorce from his lawful wife.

Philip resolved to apply for a divorce on the ground of invalidity. The success of his suit required him to show that there had been a diriment impediment between himself and Ingeburga. This was a matter of no small difficulty, as no such impediment existed. Blinded, however, by passion, he urged the plea of affinity[2] within the forbidden degrees between himself and his wife. About three months after the marriage, Philip's application for a divorce was brought before a council held at Compiegne, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Rheims. The obsequious bishops accepted the King's statements without further inquiry, and declared the marriage invalid. Ingeburga was present; but, as she did not understand French, she had not the slightest suspicion that herself was the subject under discussion. When the decision of the council was announced to her, she burst into tears, and immediately appealed to Rome, exclaiming in the few words of French that she understood: "Deceitful France! Deceitful France! Rome! Rome!"

Divorce granted by Synod of Compiegne (1193).

Decision of the Synod reversed by Celestine III.

Ingeburga's appeal to Rome was energetically prosecuted by her brother, the King of Denmark. Celestine III. having fully examined the case, reversed the decision of the French bishops, and severely censured them for their conduct. He wrote to Philip, urging him to restore

---

[1] Jungmann, v. 249; Milman, iv. 64.

[2] At this time the impediment of affinity extended to the seventh degree. See Catalani, *Conc. Ecum.*, iii. 337.

Ingeburga, who was then confined in a convent, to her rights and privileges. So far, however, was he from yielding to the Pope's decision, that he married Agnes, daughter of the Duke of Merania, thinking that he was thereby facilitating a divorce from Ingeburga. Such was the state of affairs in France at the time that Innocent III. ascended the Papal throne.

Philip takes a second wife

Innocent immediately applied himself with all his energy to bring about a separation between Philip and Agnes, and to secure Ingeburga's restoration to her former rights. He frequently warned Philip of the course he should be obliged to take if the King did not submit. But all his warning fell on deaf ears. He at length sent a legate to France, in the year 1200, who laid the country under interdict. Philip at first met the censure with open defiance, and inflicted severe penalties on those ecclesiastics who observed it. But the general discontent of his subjects, and the fear of excommunication, soon brought about a change in his conduct. He sent envoys to Rome, seeking to be reconciled to the Church. Innocent replied by sending Cardinal Octavian to France, with authority to remove the interdict if Philip was prepared to separate from Agnes and take back Ingeburga. The prescribed conditions being complied with, the censure was removed after it had been in force for seven months.

France laid under interdict by Innocent III. (1200).

The interdict removed.

But scarcely had the interdict been removed than Philip began to show the insincerity of his repentance by sending back Ingeburga to her convent prison, and demanding a further inquiry into the validity of his marriage with her. In compliance with his demand, a council was held at Soissons, in 1201, under the presidency of two Papal legates. Philip, who was present, finding that the opinion

Council of Soissons (1201).

of the fathers was opposed to him, prevented an adverse decision being pronounced by taking back Ingeburga. But no sooner had the council been disbanded than, true to his old character, he condemned her to confinement in the castle of Etampes, where she was treated with increased severity. Nor did the death of Agnes,[1] in 1201, effect any immediate change in her condition. Philip continued for years subsequently to prosecute his suit for a divorce, and to subject his lawful wife to every form of indignity, notwithstanding Innocent's repeated appeals in her favour.

Termination of the quarrel (1213).

"At length, in 1213, twenty years after the repudiation of Ingeburga, and seventeen years after she had been committed to seclusion, Philip, after consultation with the cardinal legate, and probably with a view to popular support in his quarrels with England and Flanders, consented to receive her as queen. They lived together until his death, in 1223; and Ingeburga († 1236) founded at Corbeil, where she spent her fourteen years of widowhood, a college of priests for the benefit of her husband's soul."[2]

Innocent's quarrel with John of England.

Innocent engaged in a third dispute which has a special interest for the student of English history, viz.: that with John of England. The latter succeeded to the crown, on

---

[1] Innocent afterwards legitimatized her two children, Philip and Mary, on the ground that she was probably *bona fide* in living with Philip, because of the decision of the Council of Compiegne.

[2] Rob., vi. 40. Innocent also laid Leon under interdict, and compelled Alphonso, king of that country, to break off an incestuous alliance which he had contracted with his niece. "Never, writes De Maistre, "have the Popes and the Church in general done a more signal service to society, than in checking, by the power of ecclesiastical censures, the tendency of rulers to overstep the legitimate bounds of marriage."

the death of his brother Richard, to the exclusion of his nephew, Arthur,[1] the rightful heir, whom, as was generally supposed, he caused to be murdered. John's character is drawn in dark colours by writers of all shades of opinion. "He stands before us," says Lingard,[2] "polluted with meanness, cruelty, perjury, and murder; uniting with an ambition, which rushed through every crime to the attainment of its object; a pusillanimity which, often at the sole appearance of opposition, sank into despondency. Arrogant in prosperity, abject in adversity, he neither conciliated affection in the one, nor excited esteem in the other." And Green, in his *History of England*, writes:[3] "His ingratitude and perfidy had brought down his father's hairs with sorrow to the grave. To his brother he had been the worst of traitors. All Christendom believed him to have been the murderer of his nephew, Arthur of Brittany. He had abandoned one wife, and was faithless to another. His punishments were refinements of cruelty, the starvation of children, the crushing of old men under copes of lead. His court was a brothel, where no woman was safe from the royal lust, and where his cynicism loved to publish the news of his victim's shame."

John's character

His treatment of the Church.

John's treatment of the Church was quite in keeping with his general character. Though he had sworn,[4] at his coronation, to preserve her liberties intact, he showed his regard for his oath by seizing shortly afterwards (1200) the property of the Archbishop of York, disposing of episcopal sees at pleasure, and exacting oppressive taxes from the

---

[1] Arthur was the son of John's elder brother, Geoffrey.

[2] *History of England* (fifth edition), ii. 375.

[3] Page 118.

[4] Matthew Paris, *Historia Major* (London, 1684), 166, Ad an. 1199.

clergy, to enable him to carry on those fatal wars in which his misdeeds involved him. It was impossible for Innocent to overlook such conduct. He frequently admonished John to change his mode of life, and to respect the liberties of the Church as well as the rights of his subjects; but his admonitions were in vain. It was obvious to all who watched the course of events that a struggle between John and the Holy See was inevitable.

Appointment of an Archbishop of Canterbury.

The struggle so generally expected was precipitated, in 1205, by the appointment of a successor to Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury. The King felt keenly that the late Archbishop, who championed the rights of his subjects, had been a great restraint on the exercise of his despotic power; and, on hearing of his death, he gave expression to his feeling of relief by exclaiming: "Now for the first time am I king of England." He immediately resolved that the next occupant of the see should be one who would be more pliable to his will than the last. Such an ecclesiastic he expected to find in his prime minister, John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich, whom he accordingly determined to have appointed to the vacant dignity.

The Sub-Prior of Canterbury elected by junior monks (1205).

The junior monks of Christ Church,[1] unwilling to have as their archbishop and prior one who appeared quite unsuited for the office, proceeded to exercise the right which they claimed for their monastery of electing the Archbishop of Canterbury. The choice fell on Reginald, the sub-prior. He was sent to Rome for consecration,

[1] The monks of Christ Church were for all practical purposes the cathedral chapter of Canterbury, and exercised the exclusive right for centuries of electing the archbishop, who was *ex-officio* their prior. After the Norman invasion, the bishops of the province began to claim a voice in the election of the metropolitan, though against the protests of the monks.

with instructions to keep his election secret till after the ceremony. Reginald, however, was not proof against human vanity. Immediately after his arrival in France he began to speak of himself as Archbishop of Canterbury. John, on learning what had occurred, ordered the senior monks of Christ Church to elect his favourite. The monks, fearing to disobey the King, did as they were commanded, the bishops of the province having resigned their claim, at John's request to take part in the election. Messengers were immediately despatched to Rome by the King to announce the choice of the senior monks.

John de Gray elected by senior monks.

Innocent, having examined the whole matter, set aside both elections as irregular; and decided that there was no foundation for the claim urged by the bishops of the province of Canterbury to a voice in the election of the primate. He then wrote to the monks of Canterbury, ordering them to send fifteen representatives to Rome to elect an archbishop. On their arrival in the Eternal City, acting on the advice of the Pope, they gave their votes to a distinguished countryman, named Stephen Langton, cardinal of the Roman Church, and formerly Chancellor of the University of Paris. Two monks were immediately despatched by Innocent to announce the result of the election to John, and to obtain his approval. When John heard that the claims of his favourite had been set aside, he felt so indignant that he had the Papal messengers cast into prison, wrote a sharp letter to Innocent, declaring that he would never admit the new archbishop to the kingdom, and finally punished the monks of Canterbury by expelling them from their monastery.

Election of Cardinal Langton.

Having waited in vain for two years to obtain the King's approval, Innocent himself consecrated Cardinal Langton

at Viterbo, in 1207. Even after this he continued for another year to use every means that a prudent zeal could suggest to win over the King before proceeding to adopt strong measures. But his policy of conciliation having failed, he was at length obliged to have recourse to the censures of the Church in defence of her liberties; and laid England under interdict, in 1208. This seemed merely to have the effect of still further inciting the King against the Church. He confiscated freely ecclesiastical property, visited with the severest penalties those ecclesiastics who observed the censure, and even, according to many writers,[1] entered into an alliance with the Emir of the Spanish Mohammedans against the Pope and King of France. The interdict having failed to bring about John's submission, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him in 1209; but, to all appearance, with no better result.

England laid under interdict (1208).

John excommunicated (1209).

Four years elapsed without the censures of the Church having had any effect on John's obstinacy. England was enduring unheard-of misery from his tyranny and persecution. The bishops presented a memorial to the Holy See, describing the cruelties of the King, and urging the pressing necessity of stronger measures against one who was trampling on the civil and religious rights of his subjects. The Pope finally yielded to their entreaties, and had recourse to the last effort of his authority by absolving John's subjects from their oaths of allegiance. He called on Christian princes to assist in dethroning one who had shown himself to be utterly unworthy of his exalted position.

His subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance (1212).

John was at last obliged to yield. Seeing that the King of France was making elaborate preparations to give effect

[1] Lingard, ii. 324.

to the sentence of his deposition, and that he could not rely on his subjects whom he had alienated by his tyrannical conduct, he sent ambassadors to Rome seeking to be reconciled with the Holy See. Innocent, who sought the King's conversion and not his deposition, entertained his petition favourably. He sent Pandulph, a sub-deacon of Rome, to England, with full authority to absolve John on his undertaking—(*a*) to admit the Archbishop to his see; and (*b*) to make good as far as possible the losses sustained by ecclesiastics during the recent quarrel. At a meeting held between himself and Pandulph, on the 13th May, 1213, the King having expressed his readiness to comply with the prescribed conditions, the legate promised to absolve him as soon as they were fulfilled.[1]

His submission to the Holy See (1213).

Two days later John placed in the hands of Pandulph a written document signed by himself, two bishops, nine earls, and three barons, conveying to Innocent and his successors the kingdoms of England and Ireland, to be held by himself and his heirs as fiefs of the Holy See, and promising to pay for them an annual tribute[2] of a thousand marks. John's grant was, as he himself tells us,[3] quite

He hands over his kingdom to Innocent.

---

[1] The conditions being substantially fulfilled, the excommunication was removed in the church of Winchester, on the 20th of July, 1213, and the interdict, on the 29th of June, 1214. Lingard, ii. 336, 339.

[2] This tribute was sometimes paid and sometimes evaded, till the reign of Edward III., when it was absolutely refused. Lingard, ii. 626.

[3] "Volentes nosmetipsos humiliare pro illo qui se pro nobis humiliavit, usque ad mortem, gratia Sancti Spiritus inspirante, non vi interdicti nec timore coacti, sed nostra bona, spontaneaque voluntate ac communi consilio baronum nostrorum conferimus ac libere concedimus Deo et Sanctis Apostolis ejus Petro et Paulo et Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae matronae nostrae ac Domino Papae Innocentio ejusque Catholicis successoribus, totum regnum Angliae et totum regnum Hiberniae." Matth. Paris. (†1259), *Hist. Major*, 199, Ad an. 1213.

spontaneous, not being suggested by the Holy See, nor extorted by the fear of censures or violence; and it had the sanction of the barons, who believed that they were thereby safeguarding the interests of the country against the King's tyranny. It was, no doubt, suggested by the desire to secure his crown against the King of France, who was only too anxious for an opportunity of seizing it. Nor was John disappointed by the result. For Pandulph set out for France immediately after his interview with the King of England, to warn Philip Augustus to desist from his warlike preparations against a kingdom placed under the special protection of the Holy See. Philip was obliged to submit, though not without giving expression to his feelings of bitterness against Innocent for intervening between him and the object of his ambition.

His action considered.

The judgment of posterity on John's action in handing over his kingdom to the Holy See has been generally severe, and has been expressed with sufficient force in the epithet of Lackland so generally applied to him. In fairness, however, to him, we must remember—(*a*) that he adopted the only means open to him in the circumstances of saving England from invasion by the French; (*b*) that his action had the approval of the barons, who formed the English Parliament of the time; and (*c*) that the state of vassalage was not looked on then, as now, as derogatory to the dignity of the crown, a sovereign recognising no feudal superior being the exception rather than the rule.[1]

[1] Thus, the King of Scotland was the vassal of the King of England, John was vassal of the King of France, and his brother Richard resigned his crown to the Emperor of Germany, and received it back as a fief. And many kings, as Peter II. of Aragon, voluntarily gave up their dominions to the Holy See, and received them back as fiefs for the sake of greater security. Lingard, ii. 332.

John was scarcely out of one difficulty when he found himself involved in another. His subjects, unwilling to endure any longer his tyranny and the oppressive taxes imposed on them to carry on the wars in which he was engaged for the recovery of his French possessions, wrested from him by Philip Augustus, rose in open rebellion, headed by the barons. After defeating his forces they compelled him to sign the Magna Charta, at Runnymede, near Windsor, on the 18th of June, 1215. This historic charter said to be the foundation of English liberties, consists of an introduction approving of the charter of rights, already (January, 1215) granted to the English Church, and of sixty-two articles, the chief of which were those that regarded taxation and imprisonment. Exceptional taxes were prohibited unless they were sanctioned by the great council of the nation,[1] and no free man was to be arrested or imprisoned, or deprived of his land or otherwise injured, except by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land.[2]

The Magna Charta signed

As soon, however, as John regained his liberty, he appealed to the Pope, as his feudal superior, to annul the charter that had been forced on him by the violence of his subjects. Innocent acceded to this request, not because of the contents of the charter, but because of the illegality of the means used in extorting it. First, the barons violated the rights of John, by rising in rebellion, and forcing him to concede their demands, without exhausting the constitutional methods at their disposal for redressing their wrongs. They could have recourse, for instance, to the Pope, who promised to have their grievances remedied;

The Magna Charta annulled by Innocent III.

[1] Art 1. [2] Art 40.

but they neglected to do so. Secondly, they violated the rights of the Holy See, in compelling John to yield up many privileges of the crown without reference to his lord suzerain. And thirdly, John, having taken the Cross for the Holy Land was protected by a general law[1] of the Church, which forbade the property and rights of the Crusaders to be interfered with till their return from the East. This law was openly violated by the barons in their revolt against John. "It would seem to me, therefore," writes Cardinal Manning,[2] "to be proved, even to demonstration, that the Pope condemned, not the charter, but the barons; not the laws and liberties set down in the charter, but the way and action by which the barons had wrung it from their sovereign. The Pope quashed and annulled the charter as a contract, and forbade either side to plead or act upon it; but not one word as to its contents is to be found."

The barons refused to submit to Innocent's decision, and took up arms to enforce the Great Charter. Archbishop Langton, who had taken their side against the King, was ordered to excommunicate them; but he refused, for which he was suspended. The barons offered the crown to Louis, the eldest son of Philip Augustus, who was married to John's niece. Louis accepted the offer, and crossed over to England at the head of a large army. His arrival

Prince Louis of France invited to England.

[1] Innocent appealed to this law in his letter to the English barons. "Quemadmodum," he writes, "ut de ceteris taceamus, nulla ratione dissimulare possemus opprobrium, et grave periculum totius negotii Crucifixi, quod utique immineret, nisi par auctoritatem nostram revocarentur omnino quae a tanto principe *cruce signato* taliter sunt extorta." Matthew Paris, Ad an. 1215.

[2] *Miscellanies*, ii. 274.

was hailed with general satisfaction, and he received the homage of the barons in St. Paul's, on the 2nd of June, 1216. A war ensued, the result of which appeared for some time uncertain. But the excommunication of Louis by the Papal legate, and the death of John, turned the tide of national feeling in favour of his youthful son, Henry of Winchester, whose cause was warmly advocated by Honorius III., Innocent's successor. Louis was obliged to sue for peace, and return to France, September, 1217.

Peace between Henry III. and Louis.

Innocent's relations with other countries.

There was no country in Christendom that was not brought within the sphere of Innocent's activity. It was, for instance, owing very much to his exertions that the Christians of Spain united for self-defence, under the kings of Aragon and Castile, and inflicted a fatal blow on Mohammedan ascendency in that country, by the victory of Navas de Tolosa (1212). He was chiefly instrumental in organizing the Fourth Crusade, which resulted in the founding of the Latin Kingdom of Constantinople. He interfered successfully in the disputes between the rival claimants to the crowns of Poland, Hungary, and Norway; bestowed the title of King on the Princes of Aragon and Bulgaria; and compelled Alphonsus IX. of Portugal, which country had been raised to the rank of kingdom by Alexander III., to pay the stipulated tribute to the Holy See.

The Twelfth General Council (1215)

But the great crowning event of his pontificate was the celebration of the twelfth Ecumenical, or fourth General Council of Lateran. This, the most representative and brilliant assembly yet held in the Church, was convoked in April, 1213, and opened on the feast of All Saints, 1215, in the Lateran Basilica. There were present four hundred and twelve bishops, among them being the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and representatives of

the other eastern patriarchs, over eight hundred abbots and priors, and nearly all the princes of Christendom, either personally or by their representatives.

Its decrees

Innocent presided at the Council, and explained, in his opening address, the triple purpose for which it had been convoked, viz., to promote a new crusade; to condemn errors against faith: and to pass disciplinary decrees. It was agreed that a crusade should start for the Holy Land in the course of the following year; and, with a view to secure its success, it was enacted that the Truce of God should be observed for a period of five years.[1]

Seventy canons were passed. Of these the first two were doctrinal, setting forth Catholic teaching on God, the Trinity, the Church, and the Sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist,[2] and Penance, against the Albigenses and other sectaries of the time, and condemning the Pantheism of Amalric of Bena, and the errors of the Abbot Joachim regarding the Trinity and Incarnation. The remaining canons were disciplinary, the most noteworthy being the fifth, conferring the title of patriarch on the Bishop of Constantinople, with the right of precedence to the other patriarchs of the East; the thirteenth, forbidding the institution of new religious orders; the twenty-first,

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 78.

[2] "Una est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse Sacerdos et Sacrificium Jesus Christus cujus Corpus et Sanguis in Sacramento Altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, *transubstantiatis* pane in corpus et vino in Sanguinem . . ." Cap. *Firmiter;* Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 17. From the word *Transubstantiation* being found in this decree for the first time, anti-Catholic writers, viz., Mosheim (*Hist. Eccl.*, Saec. xiii., pt. ii., cap. 3), argue that the doctrine expressed by it was invented by Innocent III.; as if the use of a new word involved the necessity of a new doctrine.

enjoining annual confession and communion under the penalty of excommunication; and the fiftieth, reducing the forbidden degrees of consanguinity and affinity from the seventh to the fourth degree.

In opening the council, Innocent took for his text the memorable words addressed by Christ to His Apostles at the Last Supper: "With desire have I desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer."[1] The words had a prophetic import, little suspected at the time, for he took ill shortly afterwards, and, after a brief sickness, died at Perugia, on the 16th of July, 1216. Thus passed away, at the early age of fifty-five, one of the greatest, and, beyond doubt, the most powerful of those who have ruled from the Chair of St. Peter.

Innocent's death (1216).

[1] St. Luke, xxii. 15.

CHAPTER VI.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE HOHENSTAUFENS. (SECOND PERIOD.)

THE struggle which was suspended during the pontificate of Innocent III. had been yet but half fought out: it could not end as long as a Hohenstaufen wore the crown of Germany. The renewal of the struggle was brought about by the ungrateful Frederick II. (1212-50), who was under so many lasting obligations to the Holy See. Renewal of the struggle.

Frederick, as we have seen, was crowned King of the Two Sicilies at the early age of four, and placed by his mother Constance under the guardianship of Innocent III., who provided for him a good literary education. On the Pope's recommendation he was elected King of Germany in 1211,[1] and was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1215, having previously promised to resign the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies to his son as soon as he received the Imperial Crown. He was crowned Emperor at Rome, five years later, by Honorius III. (1216-27), after solemnly pledging himself to defend the liberties of the Church, to protect the rights of the Holy See, and not to seek the union of the crowns of Germany and the Two Sicilies. Early history of Frederick II.

Frederick inherited the traditional ambition of his House to possess supreme authority in the Church as well

[1] His reign is generally dated from his entrance into Germany from Italy, in 1212, to claim the crown.

His character.

as in the State. But he managed to conceal, for a time, his real character from the Holy See, and thus secured the Imperial Crown. Those, however, who knew him intimately felt that a renewal of the quarrel between the Papacy and the empire was inevitable. Nor was their opinion falsified by the result. No sooner had he been crowned emperor, and had, therefore, nothing more to expect from the Pope, than he threw off all disguise, and entered on his settled policy of opposition to the Church, by appointing bishops to vacant sees and claiming the rights of sovereignty over the Papal States. He, moreover, acted as tyrant to his Italian subjects, oppressing them in various ways, especially by the imposition of exorbitant taxes. And, finally, he[1] shocked the moral sense of Christendom by his immoral life and the indignities to which he subjected his wife Constance.

His neglect to organize a crusade the immediate cause of the quarrel.

Such conduct would necessarily lead sooner or later to a quarrel between the Papacy and empire. But the conflict was hastened by Frederick's neglect to organize a crusade to which he had been long pledged. The Eastern Churches were suffering unheard-of miseries from the Mohammedan invaders, while their brethren in the West were spending their forces in internecine conflict. It had been arranged at the Council of Lateran, in 1215, that an expedition should start to their assistance in the course of the next year. In the organization of such an expedition, Frederick, as emperor-elect, should naturally take the leading part. But there was a still stronger reason why

[1] The author of the *Liber Augustalis*, printed among Petrarch's works, thus describes Frederick:—"Fuit armorum strenuus, linguarum peritus, rigorosus, luxuriosus, epicurus, nihil curans vel credens nisi temporale; fuit malleus Romanae ecclesiae." Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 207.

such should have been the case. He had bound himself by vow while yet young to organize a crusade; and he renewed his promise when he was crowned king, as well as on the occasion of his imperial coronation. Frederick, however, appeared more bent on satisfying his passions than on answering the call of duty, and urged various pretexts for delaying the expedition. A body of Crusaders started for Egypt in 1218; but they were completely routed by the Saracens. Frederick was held responsible by Christendom for their defeat, because of his culpable neglect in rendering them assistance.

Honorious, who was deeply moved by the reports that were daily reaching him regarding the sufferings of the Christians in the East, repeatedly urged Frederick to fulfil his crusading vow. The Emperor was always ready to renew his promise; but he was equally ready to find some frivolous pretext for evading it when the time arrived for its fulfilment. His conduct appeared to be that of one who took a delight in trifling with the feelings of Christendom. At length a meeting was held at San Germano, in 1225, between the Pope and Emperor, at which the latter promised for the tenth time to start on a crusade; and agreed that in case he failed to carry out his promise before the end of August, 1227, he should, *ipso facto*, incur excommunication.[1] And to bind him the more closely to

His agreement with Honorius III. at San Germano (1225)

[1] Thus Frederick, in writing to the Pope, says:—"Nos autem personaliter juravimus quod transibimus ultra mare in subsidium Terrae Sanctae . . . et praedicta omnia observabimus bona fide, lata ex nunc excommunicationis sententia, in quam incidemus, si non transfretaverimus in passagio suprascripto . . . Si autem defecerimus in aliquibus, vel in aliquo ceterorum Ecclesia Romana sententiabit in nos et in terram nostram de spontaneo, et jam praestito consensu nostro." Apud Raynaldum, Ad an. 1225, § 7.

the cause of the Eastern Christians he[1] was induced to marry (1226) Iolanthe, daughter and heiress of John of Brienne, the titular king of Jerusalem.

Honorius died on the 18th of March, 1227, before the expiration of the period allowed to Frederick for the fulfilment of his promise, and was succeeded by Gregory IX. (1227-41), a near relative[2] of Innocent III. The new Pope, who was eighty years of age at the time of his appointment, retained all the vigour and energy of youth. He was a man of irreproachable character, and was well versed in the sacred sciences, especially in canon law, to which he made valuable additions. He was universally esteemed, and is described,[3] even by Frederick, "as a man of spotless reputation, eminent as well for religion and purity of life as for eloquence and learning." He felt as keenly as his predecessors for the Christians in the East, and one of his first acts as Pope was to write to Frederick, urging the necessity of his starting immediately on the promised crusade.

Gregory IX (1227-41)

To give the appearance of sincerity to his promises, Frederick set sail (8th of September, 1227) for the East from Brindisi, the place appointed for the Crusaders from different parts of Europe to meet. But shortly after sailing he feigned indisposition, and returned to Italy, putting off the crusade till the following spring. The delay was fatal to the success of the expedition, for many of the Crusaders who had assembled in large numbers[4] from

Frederick fails to carry out his promise.

[1] His first wife died in 12zz.

[2] He is generally spoken of as Innocent's nephew, though his senior in years.

[3] Pertz, *Leges*, ii. 240; Rob., vi. 146.

[4] Matthew Paris says (Ad an. 1227) that sixty thousand came from England alone.

different parts of Europe died from hunger and pestilence, while most of the others returned to their respective countries. And thus the Emperor's culpable neglect lost to the persecuted Christians of the East an opportunity of assistance which was not likely to return.

Gregory publishes Frederick's excommunication.

On hearing that Frederick had failed to carry out his promise within the specified time, Gregory published the sentence of excommunication already pronounced against him on the 29th of September. He described the dishonesty of the Emperor's dealings with the Holy See, charging him with ingratitude; with having sought by a long series of delays to escape his crusading vow; with having caused the failure of the Egyptian expedition (1218-20); and with having deserted the last expedition, under the most frivolous pretence of sickness, to return to his former life of sensual indulgence. The sentence of excommunication was renewed against him on the following Holy Thursday, and every place in which he moved was laid under interdict.

Frederick sets out for the East (1228).

Notwithstanding the ban of excommunication, Frederick set out for the East in July, 1228, having previously provided[1] for the government of the Two Sicilies in his absence, as well as for succession to the throne in case he met his death on the expedition. His conduct in engaging in a sacred war, while a declared public enemy of the Church, shocked the feelings of Christendom. Without fighting a single battle, he concluded a peace of ten years with the Sultan of Egypt, who then ruled in Palestine, and

[1] He made no such provision before his departure in 1227, which shows that he had not really intended at the time to go to the East. See Jungmann, v. 408; and Balan, *Storia d'Italia*, xxv., n. 13.

with whom he had already exchanged presents. Jerusalem with the exception of the Mosque, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Jaffa, and some other towns were surrendered to the Christians; but they were forbidden to build the fortifications of the Holy City. The peace was vehemently denounced by the Eastern Christians and by the Pope as a fraudulent transaction, intended merely to deceive the world. The chief objections to it were that the Mosque, which had been used for some time as the cathedral of Jerusalem, was allowed to remain in the hands of the Mohammedans, and that the Christians were forbidden to fortify their cities, and had, therefore, no protection whatever against the Sultan of Damascus, who was then contending with the Sultan of Egypt for supremacy in Palestine.

He concludes a peace with the Sultan of Egypt.

Having concluded peace with the Egyptian Mohammedans, Frederick marched towards Jerusalem to receive the crown of his father-in-law. On his arrival in the Holy City he found that the news of his excommunication had preceded him thither. Having failed to get any ecclesiastic to perform the ceremony of his coronation, he entered the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and placed the crown on his own head. Gerold, patriarch of Jerusalem, in writing to Gregory, draws[1] a dark picture of Frederick's conduct during his stay in the East. He is described as speaking contemptuously of the truths of the Christian faith, as receiving presents of dancing girls from the Sultan, and as generally living as a Mohammedan rather than as a Christian.

He crowns himself King of Jerusalem.

---

[1] Gerald's letter is given by Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1229.

Shortly after his return to Europe, where the most extravagant reports of his successes in the East had been circulated by his emissaries, peace was concluded between him and Gregory at San Germano on the 28th of August, 1230. Frederick promised to restore the ecclesiastical property he had confiscated; to allow the bishops that had been exiled to return to their sees; to abstain from interfering in episcopal elections; and to recognise the feudal dependence of the Two Sicilies on the Holy See. Upon which he was absolved from the ban of excommunication by the Papal legates. Three days later he paid a visit to the Pope at Anagni. Both Gregory and Frederick gave expression, in letters written immediately afterwards, to their feelings of satisfaction at the result of the interview.

His reconciliation with Gregory (1230).

It was not long till Frederick gave signs of returning to his old policy of opposition to the Church. The first indication of the kind was the publication of a *Collection of the Laws of Sicily*, drawn up at his request by his Chancellor, Peter de Vineis. In this collection, which was intended to systematize and supersede the various laws introduced into that island by its different rulers, the rights of the Church were very much restricted, if not entirely ignored, and a legislative absolutism claimed for the Emperor. Gregory, on learning the character of the new Sicilian code, felt naturally much incensed. But being unwilling to renew the quarrel between the Papacy and the empire, he contented himself by publishing a collection of decretals in five books, made by the learned Dominican, Raymond of Pennaforte, in which the rights of the Church were fully vindicated.

Collection of the laws of Sicily.

Collection of decretals.

In the course of the year 1232 Frederick issued severe decrees against the Italians Republics, and oppressed them

in various ways, under the pretence that they were favouring heretics. These decrees came with a bad grace from one whose whole policy was one of antagonism to the Church, and who was well known to treat his Saracen subjects in Sicily with great favour; and were prompted by the hope of gaining the Pope over to his side against the Italians. But in this he was disappointed. Gregory saw at once through the dishonest inconsistency of his conduct, and protested strongly against the use that was being made of religion to punish purely political offences.

Frederick oppresses the Lombard Republics.

Frederick's son Henry, taking advantage of his father's growing unpopularity, headed a revolt (1234) against him in Germany. The revolt, was, however, soon suppressed, owing chiefly to the intervention of Gregory, who ordered the bishops of Germany to excommunicate Henry[1] unless he submitted to his father. This shows clearly that the Pope was not animated by feelings of personal enmity towards the Emperor.

Revolt of Frederick's son (1234).

The indulgence extended to Frederick by the Holy See appears to have had merely the effect of stimulating him to fresh acts of aggressiveness, tyranny, and moral depravity. He stirred up the Romans to revolt against Gregory (1236); cast a Papal legate into prison; sent bishops into exile; prevented the filling of vacant sees; seized on Sardinia, a fief[2] of the Holy See, which he bestowed on his natural son Enzio; and, finally, scandalized Christendom by the general wickedness of his life.

Frederick's open hostility to the Holy See.

---

[1] Having shortly afterwards again rebelled he was condemned to imprisonment for life. He died in 1242, from a wound received in falling from his horse while passing from one prison to another.

[2] Sardinia was a fief of the Holy See either from the time of Charlemagne, or, as some think, from the time of the Countess Matilda of Tuscany.

Gregory was unceasing in his efforts to win Frederick over to the side of religion and justice. Finding, however, that all his efforts were fruitless, he entered into a league with the Lombards, and issued a Bull on Palm Sunday, 1239, excommunicating the Emperor, and releasing his subjects from their oaths of allegiance. In this Bull were recounted the chief charges against Frederick which required the Holy See to have recourse to such extreme measures. Frederick retaliated by bringing counter-charges against Gregory, by exiling the clergy that were known to be opposed to him, and by imposing heavy taxes on church property. Gregory, in replying, denied the truth of the allegations made against him, and mentioned some additional charges against Frederick generally believed at the time; among others, that he said the world had been led astray by three impostors, viz., Christ, Mohammed, and Moses. Though Frederick afterwards denied that he had ever used such words,[1] the fact of the charge having been pretty generally received is a sufficient commentary on his character. "It seems certain," says Robertson, "that he indulged in a dangerous laxity of belief and levity of expression; and the facts of his life bear out in great measure the charges made against him, of excessive licentiousness, cruelty, cunning, treachery, and falsehood."

Frederick's subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance (1239).

[1] Many writers maintain that he did use the words. For one of his travelling companions in the East testifies that he frequently spoke of the Christian religion in terms of contempt. His denial of the charge is not worth much, as he denied numerous charges of which he was certainly guilty. See Jungmann, v. 414; and Reinaud, *Extraits des Historiens Arabes relatifs aux Croisades*, 431.

Convocation of a General Council (1240).

As the most effective means of devising measures for the protection of the Church, Gregory convoked a General Council, on the 9th August, 1240, to meet at Rome in the following April. Though Frederick had formerly appealed on more than one occasion to such an assembly against the Pope, he now addressed letters to the bishops of Christendom warning them not to go to Rome. He had the passes of the Alps strictly guarded, and placed a fleet under the command of Enzio to watch the approaches to Rome by sea. A large number of French ecclesiastics on their way to the council chartered vessels from the Genoese to convey them to Rome. On their way thither they were attacked by Enzio's fleet. Three of their vessels were sunk, and the rest captured. It is said that as many as three thousand prisoners fell into the hands of Enzio, among them being three Papal legates and a large number of bishops and abbots. The shock caused to Gregory by the news of this catastrophe was so great that he died shortly afterwards on the 21st of August, 1241.

Enzio arrests ecclesiastics on their way to Rome.

Election of Innocent IV. (1243).

On the death of Celestine IV., Gregory's successor, who reigned only seventeen days, the Papal chair remained vacant for over a year and a-half, as the cardinals, fearing violence from the Imperialists, fled from Rome, and took refuge in different castles throughout Italy. Having, however, received assurances of safety from the Emperor, they came together at Anagni, and elected (24th June, 1243) Sinibald Fiesco, a native of Genoa, who took the name of Innocent IV. On hearing of the election of the new Pope, who had always been favourably disposed to him, Frederick remarked:—"As cardinal, Fiesco was my friend, but as Pope he will be my enemy, for no Pope can be a Ghibelline."

Immediately after his election Innocent turned his attention to settling the quarrel between the Papacy and the empire. Legates were sent to Frederick to assure him of the Pope's benevolent dispositions towards him, and to prevail on him, if possible, to abandon his attitude of hostility to the Church. For a time it was generally hoped that Innocent's efforts would be successful. A treaty of peace was actually agreed to on the 31st of March, 1244, by which the Emperor promised to yield in whatever led to his excommunication; to made good as far as possible the injuries inflicted on the Church during the recent quarrel; and to release the prisoners taken by Enzio. The Emperor was to be absolved from the ban of excommunication as soon as he had fulfilled his promises. But no sooner had the treaty been concluded, than Frederick, true to his well-known character for duplicity, refused to abide by its terms. He demanded absolution before he would allow the prisoners to be restored to freedom. Innocent, knowing thoroughly the man with whom he was dealing, refused to comply with this demand. Frederick forthwith marched towards Rome, with the intention of settling the quarrel between them by an appeal to arms. But his designs were frustrated by the hasty flight of Innocent, who sought refuge in France, where he was kindly received by the saintly king, Louis IX.

His efforts to reconcile Frederick II. with the Church.

His flight from Rome (1244).

From Lyons, where he fixed his residence, he addressed letters to the bishops of the Christian world, early in 1245, summoning them to attend a general council which was to open in that city on the coming feast of St. John the Baptist. In response to the letters of convocation, there attended at the opening of the council three patriarchs, viz., those of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia, and

The first General Council of Lyons (1245).

one hundred and forty bishops.[1] The Emperor also sent representatives to defend him, under the lead of his Chancellor, Thaddeus of Suessa, a man well skilled in canon and civil law.

Held for a four fold purpose.

Innocent, who presided, delivered an address[2] at the first session, in which he explained the objects for which the fathers had been called together, viz., to pass disciplinary decrees; to organize a crusade; to effect a reunion between the Greek and Latin Churches; to adopt measures for the protection of Christian Europe against the Tartars,[3] and to settle the dispute between the Papacy and the empire.

Having passed seventeen decrees on ecclesiastical discipline, the organization of a crusade, and the protection of Europe against the Tartars, the fathers turned their attention to the consideration of the charges against the Emperor. After mature deliberation they confirmed the sentence of his excommunication and deposition in the third general session because of—(*a*) the repeated violations of the treaties he

---

[1] It is probable that the number was afterwards increased, as the contemporary *Chronicle of Erford* states that there were as many as two hundred and fifty bishops present. Palma, iii. 334.

[2] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 378.

[3] The Tartars were originally the same as the Mongols. But when Genghis Khan, the illustrious chief of one of their tribes, during the early part of the thirteenth century, succeeded in establishing his sway over the whole of Central Asia and Eastern Europe, from the coast of China to the frontiers of Germany, their name was given to the subject races, and the territories over which they ruled were known by the general name of Tartary. On the death of Genghis Khan, in 1237, the Tartars sought to extend their conquests further west. They swept over Poland and Hungary, visiting the vanquished with the greatest cruelty. But after a temporary success they were defeated by the imperial forces, and compelled to withdraw to Eastern Europe, where they finally settled down.

had entered into with the Holy See: (*b*) the arrest of cardinals and other ecclesiastics on their way to Rome in 1241; (*c*) heresy, of which he was declared to be gravely suspected; and (*d*) the indignities offered to the Holy See by his letters, and his invasion of the Papal States. The sentence was solemnly pronounced by the Pope,[1] accompanied by "the extinction of candles and other symbolical ceremonies prescribed by the ritual: while the general awe was heightened by the appearance of a meteor, which, as the words were uttered, shot across the sky."[2] The scene was so affecting that even Thaddeus of Suessa gave way to sighs and tears, exclaiming: "This is a day of wrath."

Sentence of deposition pronounced against Frederick.

The sentence does not appear to have had as much effect on the Emperor as it had on his Chancellor; for, on hearing of it at Turin, he merely asked for his caskets to see whether he had lost any of his crowns; and placing one of them on his head, he declared he would part with it only after a bloody struggle. The time was much nearer than he thought when he should part with his crowns. For the present, however, the sentence of the council had only the effect of arousing him to pursue his course of tyranny and opposition to the Church with increased activity. He wrote letters to the princes of Christendom, soliciting their assistance against the Pope, whom he described as the most dangerous enemy of kings; imposed exorbitant taxes on

The immediate effect of the sentence on Frederick.

---

[1] In writing to the monks of Citeaux, Innocent declares that it was with feelings of pain and regret he was forced to proceed to extremes against Frederick. "Nec aliquam viam," he says, "invenimus, sine Dei injuria et gravi ejus offensa et Ecclesiae ejusdem laesione et conscientiarum nostrarum vulnere aliter procedendi, quam ut processimus, licet *inviti et ejusdem miseriae condolentes.*"

[2] Rob., vi. 181.

the clergy; appropriated the revenues of vacant benefices;[1] exiled all ecclesiastics who dared to respect the sentence of the fathers of Lyons; and carried on a war of great cruelty against the Lombards.

Frederick's reverses.

Notwithstanding Frederick's energy in defending his cause against all opposition, the day of retribution was fast approaching. After the sentence of his deposition had been pronounced by the Council of Lyons, disaster after disaster overtook him in quick succession. The electors of Germany, acting on the Pope's advice, met at Hochheim,

Election of a rival (1246).

in 1246, and elected as their king, Henry Raspe, Landgrave of Thuringia. The latter shortly afterwards gained a signal victory over Frederick's troops, led by his son Conrad; but the victory was reversed about six months later (February, 1247), at a battle fought near Ulm. On the death of Henry, a few days afterwards, a successor was elected in the person of William the youthful Count of Holland.

While Conrad carried on the war in Germany in behalf of his father with great energy and success, Frederick himself took charge of the Italian campaign. After reducing the Milanese to subjection, he marched against Parma, the gates of which were shut against him. He immediately laid siege to the city, and erected close by a fortified town to which, in confident anticipation of the victory that awaited him, he gave the name of Victoria. He little

Frederick defeated by the Parmesans (1248).

suspected that he was nearest to defeat when he felt most certain of victory. Yet such was the case. After the siege had lasted for seven months, the Parmesans suddenly attacked (February, 1248) the Emperor's stronghold

[1] We are told that he kept fifty sees and innumerable inferior benefices vacant. Rob., vi. 183; Raumer, iv. 85.

defeated his troops, and carried away his crowns! Among the prisoners taken by the victors, was Thaddeus of Suessa, who, after being subjected to various tortures, was finally condemned to death.

In the course of the following year (1249) Enzio was defeated and taken prisoner by the Bolognese, who refused to be influenced either by threats or promises, to deliver up the royal captive. Having collected a large army, Frederick set out to secure the release of his son.[1] But, being taken suddenly ill on the way, he died[2] at Caste, Fiorentino, on the 13th of December, 1250, having been previously reconciled with the Church by the Archbishop of Palermo. Shortly before his death, he committed some of the greatest crimes of his life. He had women and children cruelly tortured in Italy, because of the opposition of their husbands and parents; he caused Peter de Vineis[3] to be deprived of his sight on the suspicion of treachery, and thus paraded through several cities; and, finally, he ordered the Bishop of Arezzo to be cruelly murdered.

His death (1250).

Innocent, on hearing the death of Frederick, returned to Italy, in 1251, after an absence of seven years. He refused to bestow the kingdom of the two Sicilies on Conrad IV., Frederick's son and successor in Germany, as he had already given sufficient indication of his intention to follow in the footsteps of his father. Conrad forthwith led an army across the Alps to enforce his claim to his

Innocent IV. returns to Italy (1251).

---

[1] He remained in prison, in Bologna, till his death, in 1272.

[2] According to some contemporary writers, he was poisoned by his natural son, Manfred. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1250.

[3] On hearing that he was to be delivered over to the Pisans, his bitterest enemies, he committed suicide by knocking his head against a pillar to which he was chained.

father's possessions in Southern Italy. His arms were attended with considerable success, and, like his father, he treated the vanquished with great cruelty. His career was, however, cut short by his sudden death, in 1254, at the early age of twenty-six. He was followed to the grave two years later by William of Holland, his rival in Germany. A throne was thereby left vacant, to which no one appeared willing to aspire.

Death of Conrad IV. (1254).

Conradin.

Conrad's death left his son Conradin, a child of two years, the only legitimate representative of the House of Hohenstaufen. The claim of the youthful Conradin to the kingdom of the Two Sicilies was favoured by Innocent, who appointed his uncle, Manfred, regent during his minority. But Manfred shortly afterwards proved false to his trust by claiming the kingdom for himself. For this, as well as for his tyrannical oppression of his subjects, he was excommunicated, in 1258, by Alexander IV. (1254-61), Innocent's successor. Heedless of the excommunication, he had himself crowned king of the Two Sicilies in the course of the same year, and retaliated on the Pope by invading some of his possessions in Southern Italy. Alexander and his successor, Urban IV. (1261-64) having failed in their efforts to bring about a reconciliation between Manfred and the Church, Clement IV. (1265-68) bestowed the kingdom on Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX. of France. The latter, having led an army into Italy, defeated and slew Manfred at the battle of Benevento (1266), and thus made good his claim to the Two Sicilies.

Manfred claims the Two Sicilies.

The kingdom bestowed on Charles of Anjou (1265).

Charles's rule over his new subjects was marked by even greater cruelty than that of his predecessor. The discontented Sicilians invited Conradin from Germany to

become their king. Against the advice of his friends and the protests of the Pope, he accepted the invitation, and crossed the Alps, in 1267, upon which he was immediately excommunicated. The campaign was brief and decisive. Conradin was defeated at the battle of Tagliacozzo, and was taken prisoner. Shortly afterwards he[1] was beheaded at Naples, in 1268, notwithstanding the earnest appeals of the Pope in his favour. Thus perished, at the early age of sixteen, the last hope of the once powerful dynasty of the Hohenstaufens.

Conradin beheaded (1268).

There is something very striking in the downfall of this House. Few can read its history without feeling that

[1] His death was fully avenged fourteen years later by the massacre known in history as the Sicilian Vespers. We are told that Conradin while standing on the scaffold, immediately before his execution threw his glove into the surrounding crowd. It was picked up by a faithful follower, who carried it to Peter of Aragon, who was married to Constance, daughter of Manfred, and last representative of the Hohenstaufens. Peter resolved to have revenge for the death of his kinsman, and applied himself resolutely, but secretly, to organize an expedition against Sicily. A Salernian knight, named John of Procida, whose possessions had been confiscated for having taken the side of Conradin, acted in concert with the King of Aragon, and organized a conspiracy in Sicily for the deliverance of that island from the tyrannical yoke of the French. The conspiracy having been fully matured, the French residents in Palermo were all massacred, on Easter Monday, 1282. The signal for the massacre to commence was the ringing of the vesper-bell; hence the name. The example set by the Palermitans was immediately followed through the island. Darras says (Engl. ed., iii. 410) that there were as many as 20,000 slain; others, however, with more probability, place the number much lower. The French residents are said to have been known by the way they pronounced the Italian *c* in such words as *Ciceri*. The immediate result of the Sicilian Vespers was the separation of Sicily from Southern Italy and its annexation to Aragon. The efforts of Martin IV. (1281-85) to prevent the annexation were equally unsuccessful both with the Sicilians and Peter of Aragon. The latter was excommunicated, and his subjects released from their oaths of allegiance; his kingdom which was a fief of the Holy See, being offered to Charles of Valois, son of Philip III. of France.

Providence had declared against it. "Frederick left several children, legitimate and illegitimate, behind him. But a weird fate was upon him and upon his race. An evil destiny pursues them; they perish one by one, and by strange dooms; until the last male scion of that imperial strain comes

> Wandering by
> A shadow like an angel, with bright hair
> Dabbled in blood.

The end of the Hohenstaufens.

It is the young and beautiful Conradin, grandson of Frederick, least guilty—humanly speaking, the one unguilty of a guilty race—who yet, as so often happens, gathers up in himself all the curse and the punishment that was due by all, and paying the things that he never took, attests how impossible it is to dissociate the members of a family from each other."[1]

[1] Trench, *Lect. on Med. Ch. History*, page 183.

CHAPTER VII.

LOUIS IX. OF FRANCE.

WITH perhaps the single exception of Charlemagne, no prince of medieval Europe has stronger claims on the attention of the student of Church History than Louis IX. of France, the noblest type of Christian chivalry, who combined in himself the highest qualities of the saint, the soldier, and the statesman.

His early life.

He was the son of Louis VIII. of France and Blanche of Castile, and was born at Poissy[1] on the 24th of April, 1215. He inherited from his parents many of those qualities that adorned his future life. His father having died in 1226, his early training devolved almost exclusively on his mother. She took great pains to instil into his youthful mind the lessons of piety and virtue. "I love you, my dear son," she would say, "with all the tenderness of a mother; but I should infinitely prefer to see you fall dead at my feet than that you would ever commit a mortal sin." Nor did she neglect his literary education. She procured for him some of the best masters in France, under whom he made marked progress in his studies. He learned to speak Latin fluently, studied the writings of many of the fathers, and acquired a special taste for history.

On the death of his father, Blanche became regent of

---

[1] *Acta Sanctorum*, xxxviii. 287.

Blanche regent during his minority.

France during his minority. Her task was one of grave difficulty. Many of the chief barons who had hitherto recognised a merely nominal allegiance to the crown, taking advantage of the government of the kingdom by a woman, endeavoured to assert their independence. They refused[1] to attend at the ceremony of Louis' coronation at Rheims, in 1226, and immediately afterwards rose in open rebellion. But the ability and administrative tact of Blanche soon reduced them to subjection, and completed the work begun by Philip Augustus[2] of making the authority of the crown respected throughout France.[3] And to further safeguard the interests of her son, she placed the kingdom under the protection of the Holy See. She was thus enabled to hand over to Louis, on the attainment of his majority (1236), a peaceful and united kingdom. Nor did her power cease with the resignation of the regency; she continued to exercise a great influence in the affairs of France down to her death, in 1252.

---

[1] Matthew Paris, Ad an. 1226.

[2] Before his accession, most of the chief vassals, while recognising the nominal suzerainty of the crown, were practically independent, and some of them are said to have been even more powerful than the kings of the country. But Philip, taking advantage of John's difficulties with his English subjects, wrested from him most of his French possessions; and used the increased power which he thereby gained to reduce some of the chief vassals to subjection—hence the title of Augustus accorded to him by posterity.

[3] In the different wars in which she was compelled to engage, she received the active co-operation of Theobald, Count of Champagne and, after 1234, King of Navarre. Hence her enemies circulated the report that she was guilty of immorality.

[4] Gregory IX., in replying to the request of Blanche and Louis to take France under his protection, says: "Hujusmodi ergo consideratione inducti supplicationibus vestris clementer annuimus, et personas vestras cum ipso regno, familiis et omnibus bonis vestris sub B. Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus." *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. xxxviii. 296.

In 1234, Louis married Margaret, daughter of the Count of Provence, a princess remarkable no less for her virtue than for her beauty. The marriage was a happy one, and has given to France a long line of rulers, interrupted for the present by the expulsion of Louis Philippe from the throne in 1848. His marriage (1234).

Believing that a king should be an example to his subjects, no less in personal sanctity than in devotion to civic duty, he led a most austere and virtuous life. He daily heard mass, twice at least, and on some days three or four times, and attended the recitation of the canonical hours. He went to confession every Friday, and received the discipline from his confessor;[1] he was diligent in reading the Sacred Scriptures and the writings of St. Augustine, abstemious as to food and drink, and frequently attended on the poor and afflicted. When some of his courtiers complained that he gave too much time to works of piety and religion, he simply replied that if he spent twice as much time in public sports and pastimes no one would blame him. He showed great respect and reverence to the clergy, both secular and regular, and especially to the Dominicans and Franciscans with whom he was connected as a tertiary; and declared that if he could divide himself into two, he would give half to each of the Orders. His piety and austerities.

"His justice was such, that of his own accord he gave up to the English king some territories which had once belonged to England; and from a like motive he caused an inquiry to be made as to the possessions acquired by the crown during the last three reigns, and restored those which His justice

[1] His confessor was Godfrey of Beaulieu, a Dominican, who afterwards wrote his life.

had been unjustly obtained. The reputation of his virtue induced Henry III. and the insurgent barons to chose him as arbiter of their differences."[1]

He attends to the administration of the law.

Louis never allowed his spiritual exercises to interfere with his public duties. He paid special attention to the administration of justice, appointing learned and upright judges, and putting down corruption with a strong hand; and thus secured respect for the law, making the people feel that it was administered in their interests. He had severe laws enacted against usury and blasphemy,[2] and protected the tenants of the chief vassals of the crown from oppression. In the wars in which he was obliged to engage with his rebellious vassals, he was most successful; and he defeated Henry III. of England at Taillebourg, in 1242, and shortly afterwards at Saintes.

His charities.

He was enabled by his economy, in retrenching all expenses not required by the dignity of the crown, to devote a large amount of money to public charities and the erection of monuments to his zeal throughout France. The number of churches, monasteries, colleges, and hospitals said to have been founded by him is almost incredible. His churches were built in the Gothic style[3] of architecture, then prevalent throughout France and Germany, and were all remarkable for their costliness and beauty. The most beautiful church of the thirteenth

---

[1] Rob., vi. 217.

[2] He published an ordinance ordering all who were guilty of blasphemy to be marked on the lips, or, according to some, on the forehead, with a red-hot iron.

[3] This style, characterized by the pointed arch, made its appearance during the twelfth century, and was called Gothic by the Italians, who at first condemned it as the work of an uncivilized people. The term has, however, outlived the period of its contempt.

century is the Sainte Chapelle, in Paris, built by him to receive the Crown of Thorns[1] forwarded to him, in 1239, by Baldwin II., Latin King of Constantinople, and a part of the True Cross and other precious relics sent two years later by the same king, in recognition of Louis' piety, and the services rendered to the Christians in the East by the French nation. The Sainte Chapelle.

The most remarkable educational foundation of his reign was the Sorbonne, which owes its origin as well as its name to his chaplain, Robert, a native of Sorbonne. It was founded in 1250, in connection with the Paris University, to enable secular priests to pursue the higher studies of theology after completing their ordinary course. Robert, who was himself the first head of the new college, drew up its constitution, which remained in force till the Revolution. The number of members was originally fixed at fifteen; but was afterwards raised to thirty-six by Cardinal Richelieu († 1642), by whom the institution was completely renovated and much enlarged. Persons were admitted by the votes of the members, after a public thesis in theology extending over a whole day. The Sorbonne was at first quite distinct from the theological faculty of the university, though members of the one were frequently members of the other. They remained distinct in theory down to the Revolution, though after the fourteenth century they were generally regarded as practically the same. The Sorbonne.

Nor was Louis' charity confined to his own dominions. It extended even to the distant East. Fired by the enthusiasm of the age, and the desire of assisting his persecuted fellow-Christians, he set out on a crusade, in His first crusade (1248-50).

[1] *Acta Sanct.*, xxxviii. 354, 357.

1248, appointing his mother regent in his absence. Believing that Palestine could never be secure as long as Egypt was in the hands of the Mohammedans, he directed his course to Damietta, which he took in 1249. He shortly afterwards defeated the enemy at the battle of Mansurah.

His captivity.

But his success was unexpectedly turned into defeat by the imprudence of his brother, the Count of Artois, who commanded a section of the army. The latter pursued the flying enemy too far, whereupon the Mohammedans taking advantage of the division in the Christian army returned by a circuitous route, and having defeated the king's troops made him captive. We are told that the victors were so much struck by the noble qualities of their royal prisoner that they contemplated making him their sovereign. Louis and his followers were restored to freedom in 1250, on the surrender of Damietta to the Mohammedans. and the payment of a large ransom. He spent the next two years in the East, visiting different places of pilgrimage, and strengthening the fortifications that still remained in the hands of the Christians. The death of his mother, in 1252, obliged him to return to France.

He receives ambassadors from the Great Khan.

On his way to Egypt, in 1248, Louis was met at Cyprus by two ambassadors who professed to have come from the Great Khan,[2] or King of the Eastern Tartars. They said that their master, who had received baptism, was anxious to enter into an alliance with the King of France, and asked to have missionaries sent to preach the Gospel

[1] Joinville († 1310). *Life of St. Louis*, 77.

[2] On the death of Genghis Khan, in 1237, his vast possessions were distributed among his three sons; the youngest, who ruled over Eastern Tartary, becoming the Great Khan.

among his subjects. Louis immediately despatched envoys to the East bearing valuable gifts, accompanied by missionaries. He was the more willing to comply with the request of the Great Khan, as exaggerated reports[1] had been circulated through Europe during the last century regarding the magnificence and power of one of the Great Khan's predecessors, named Prester John, who was represented as a Christian priest and ruler of a mighty kingdom. On the arrival of the missionaries at Kara-Korum, the capital of the Tartar Empire, they found that the sovereign who had sent the ambassadors had died, and had been succeeded by one opposed to Christianity, whereupon they returned to Europe. Other missionaries were sent to the East by Innocent IV. (1243-54). But they found only a few Nestorian Christians among the Tartars. Their labours, as well as those of the missionaries who followed them, were not attended with much success.

Missionaries sent to the East.

The accounts sent to the West by the missionaries in Eastern Tartary induced many travellers to visit a country so generally described as full of the strange and the wonderful. Among these the most celebrated was a noble Venetian, named Marco Polo († 1323), who set out for China, about 1274, in company with his father and uncle. After spending seventeen years in travelling through various parts of Central and Eastern Asia, he returned to Venice. Being taken captive shortly afterwards by the Genoese, he was cast into prison, where he wrote an account of his travels in the East. His writings aroused

Marco Polo.

---

[1] They appear to have their origin in the boasts of the Eastern Nestorians, who represented their convert as much superior in wealth and power to the emperors of the West. Rob., v. 251.

a wonderful spirit of nautical enterprise in different parts of Europe, and fired the mind of Columbus with the desire of arriving at the Eastern coast of Asia by sailing in a westerly direction.

The Pragmatic Sanction.

A well-known document called the *Pragmatic Sanction*,[1] has been ascribed to Louis, the authenticity of which has given rise to considerable controversy. As given in Harduin,[2] it consists of a brief introduction, declaring that the kingdom of France "is now and always has been under the protection of God alone," and six articles which run as follows :—

Its articles.

(*a*) "All prelates and patrons of ecclesiastical benefices shall enjoy the full rights of collation according to the canons of the Church.

(*b*) "The cathedrals and other churches of the kingdom shall have full freedom of election.

(*c*) "We will and decree that the vice of simony, so injurious to the Church, be rooted out within our realm.

(*d*) "We also will and decree that promotions, collations, provisions, and dispositions of prelacies, dignities, and all other benefices and offices be made according to the common law, the councils, and the fathers.

(*e*) "We will that no one impose or collect taxes imposed by the Court of Rome, by which our kingdom is impoverished, either now or hereafter, except in the case of

---

[1] A Pragmatic Sanction was any important ordinance issued by the French sovereigns on ecclesiastical affairs. The name appears to have been first applied to the ordinance under consideration by the University of Paris in an appeal which it addressed to the King in 1491; and was, no doubt, used in allusion to the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438). Jungmann, v. 437.

[2] *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 643. The fifth article is not found in some old MSS.

reasonable and urgent necessity recognised by us and the French Church."

(*f*) By the sixth article, which is somewhat longer than any of the preceding, the rights and privileges granted by different kings to the French Church are approved.[1]

Its authenticity defended by some.

The authenticity of the Pragmatic Sanction, as thus set forth, is defended by many writers, including those of the Gallican School. It was called forth, they say, by a decree issued by Clement IV., in 1268, claiming the right to dispose of vacant benefices and expectancies; and was intended to guard the privileges of the French Church, and to protect it against the imposition of heavy taxes by the Court of Rome.

Rejected by most modern writers.

This opinion is, however, rejected by most modern Catholic writers of note, who maintain that the document is a forgery of a later date.

(*a*) The document not referred to before 438.

First. We find it mentioned, for the first time, in 1438, when it was appealed to as a precedent for the Pragmatic Sanction, issued that year at Bourges. It is not referred to by any of the saint's numerous biographers. Nor is it referred to by any of the Popes, against whom it is said to have been issued, not even by Boniface VIII., who canonized him; and this silence is the more significant when we remember the earnestness with which they protested against the similar ordinance of Bourges. Nor, finally, is it embodied in the Regesta, or collection of French laws, commenced shortly after Louis' death, which professes to contain all enactments issued since 1255. Such silence about a document, which, if issued by Louis, would have

---

[1] The ordinance is dated from Paris, March, 1269.

been the most important of his reign, can scarcely be reconciled with the supposition of its genuineness.

(*b*) It contains forms of expression not used at the time.

Secondly. It contains forms of expression not then used in public documents. This is specially true of the titles by which the Royal officials are designated.

(*c*) Its tenor at variance with Louis' piety.

Thirdly. The whole tenor of the Pragmatic Sanction, which is one of opposition to the Holy See, is completely at variance with Louis' well-known piety and the friendly relations that always existed between him and the Popes. It is stated, for instance, in the introduction, that the kingdom of France was under the protection of no one except God; whereas we know that it had been already placed twice under the protection of the Holy See, viz., during his minority, and during his absence on the first of his crusades. And at the very time when this decree is said to have been issued, he was preparing to place it under the same protection for the third time.

(*d*) Such a document would have been inopportune for Louis himself.

Fourthly. The publication of a royal decree at the time, forbidding the Holy See to levy taxes on the French Church, would have been most inopportune; for these were chiefly intended to defray the expenses of a crusade to the Holy Land, on which Louis himself was just about to start.[1]

Second Crusade, of Louis (1270).

Louis' end was worthy of his life. Hearing that Antioch had been taken (1268) by the Sultan of Egypt, he resolved to make a final effort for the redemption of the Holy Land from the hands of the Saracens.

Having made elaborate preparations, he set out, in 1270, on the last of the Crusades, at the head of 60,000 men.

---

[1] Some writers, while defending the general authenticity of the Pragmatic Sanction, reject the fifth article as a forgery.

Being driven by adverse winds to the coast of Sardinia, he directed his course towards Tunis, with the intention of establishing there a Christian colony for the conversion of the Mohammedans, who then ruled over the whole of North Africa. He had scarcely landed near the site of ancient Carthage when a violent plague broke out among the army. Its noblest victim was the saintly King of France, who passed to his reward on the 25th of August, 1270. "The majesty of the dying saint," says Villeneuve, "never shone with more undimmed lustre than upon that throne of agony, with a crucifix for his sceptre, and a halo of glory for his diadem."

His death (1270).

His name was placed on the Calendar of the Saints by Boniface VIII., in 1297. The tribute thus paid to his memory has been endorsed by writers of every shade of opinion, Christian and Infidel, Catholic and Protestant. Thus while Hallam paints[1] him "as perhaps the most eminent pattern of unswerving probity and Christian strictness of conscience that ever held a sceptre in any country," the sceptical Voltaire is obliged to join in the general chorus of praise, by declaring[2] that "it is not given to man to carry virtue to a higher point."

His virtues universally admitted.

We cannot, therefore, be surprised to find that those of his own creed and country become eloquent in describing his virtues. "Whether we view Louis," says Darras,[3] "on the fields of Saintes and Mansurah, or in a library dispensing to those who sought there the literary treasures he had drawn from the collected volumes; whether in

---

[1] *Middle Ages* (eleventh edition), i. 31.

[2] *Hist. Generale*, ii. 391.

[3] *Gen. Hist. of the Church* (English edition), iii. 363.

public audiences, when deciding disputes at the gates of the palace, or under the oak at Vincennes, without court or generals, or when chosen as umpire between contending princes, or dying near the ruins of Carthage, we are at a loss to tell which we should most admire in him, the knight, the scholar, the patriarch, the king, or the Christian."

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CRUSADES.

Their general character.

THE Crusades, sometimes spoken of as the Trojan war of modern history,[1] were the great military expeditions undertaken during the Middle Ages to protect the Christians of the East from oppression by the infidels. They extended over a period of about two centuries, during which Christian Europe sent its bravest and its best to shed their blood for the faith. While the Crusades are frequently scoffed at by irreligious writers as "immoral and wicked schemes, contrived by knaves and executed by fools," they must always appear to the religious-minded as the most striking manifestation of a lively faith that the world has ever seen. "Grand and immortal movement," exclaims Balmez,[2] "where hundreds of nations advance to certain death—not in pursuit of a miserable self-interest; not to find an abode in milder and more fertile countries; not for an ardent desire to obtain for themselves earthly advantages; but inspired only by a religious idea, by a jealous desire to possess the tomb of Him who expired on the Cross for the salvation of the human race! When compared with this, what becomes of the lofty deeds of the Greeks chanted by Homer? Greece arises to avenge

---

[1] Heeren, *Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades* (Paris, 1808), 67.

[2] *European Civilization*, chapter xlii.

an injured husband; Europe to redeem the sepulchre of its God."

To understand the purpose and necessity of the Crusades, it will be necessary for us to review briefly the condition of the Holy Land before the twelfth century.

Condition of Palestine before 12th century.

As we have already seen,[1] Palestine became a tributary province of Rome in the year 63 B.C. From that time it remained subject to the Roman or Byzantine emperors, till 637, when it was conquered by the Arabs under Omar, the successor of Mohammed. The new rulers required their Christian subjects to pay an annual tribute; but otherwise treated them with toleration, and allowed pilgrims from the West to visit the Holy Places in Palestine on the payment of a small tax.

Palestine conquered by the Mohammedans of Egypt.

This state of affairs continued till 980, when Palestine was conquered from the Arabs by the Mohammedans of Egypt. These latter oppressed their Christian subjects, desecrated the Holy Place, and subjected pilgrims[2] to various insults and indignities. Reports of these atrocities having reached Sylvester II. (999-1002), he conceived the idea of arming the nations of the West for the defence of the oppressed Christians in the East. But the disturbed state of Europe at the time rendered it impossible for him to give effect to his designs. Almost a century was yet to elapse before the Eastern Christians were to receive any succour from their brethren in the West.

Conquered by the Seljuk Turks.

The condition of the Christians in Palestine became still worse in 1073, when the country was overrun by a bar-

---

[1] Vol. i., 9.

[2] They were very numerous at the time, as the end of the world was expected by many about the year 1000.

barous horde of Seljuk Turks[1] that had recently embraced Islam. The new conquerors knew little or nothing of the religion they professed, and treated the subject Mohammedans with almost the same cruelty as they did the Christians. Accounts of the miseries which the latter had to endure soon reached the West, and had such an effect on Gregory VII. that he wrote, immediately after his elevation to the Papacy, to some of the princes of Europe soliciting assistance for the Eastern Christians. But the quarrel in which he was shortly afterwards involved with Henry IV. prevented him from urging on his project.

First Crusade (1097-99).

The time at length arrived when the enthusiasm of Latin Christendom was aroused by the burning eloquence of Peter the Hermit, to encounter the fanaticism of Islam. This remarkable man was born of noble parents, at Amiens, in France. At an early age he embraced the life of a soldier; but soon growing weary of the world, he withdrew to a monastery, and shortly afterwards became a hermit. Having gone on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, in 1093, he witnessed the sufferings of his fellow Christians in the East, and the profanation of the Holy Places by infidels. On his return to Europe, he described the scenes he had witnessed to Urban II. (1089-99). The Pope, moved by the tale of misery he had heard, as well as by the repeated appeals for assistance he had received from the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius Comnenus (1081-1118), commissioned the French hermit to preach a crusade.

Peter the Hermit.

---

[1] The Seljuk Turks, a branch of the great family of the Turks, settled down to the east of the Caspian Sea during the eighth century, and derived their name from Seljuk, one of their most successful leaders, who flourished about the end of the tenth century. For the character of the Seljuk Turks, see Michaud, *History of the Crusades* (Eng. edition), i. 34, 35.

Authorized by Urban II. to preach a crusade.

Peter set out on his mission of charity, clothed in the garb of a pilgrim. He went from province to province, through Italy, France, and Germany, riding on a mule, with his head and feet bare, and holding a crucifix in his hands. His presence was everywhere the signal for enthusiasm; his eye seemed instinct with that fire which burned within his own restless soul; and his eloquence was such as comes from the heart and arouses nations to action. He "appealed to every passion; to valour and to shame; to indignation and pity; to the pride of the warrior, the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian; to the love of the brethren; to the hatred of the unbeliever, aggravated by his insulting tyranny; to reverence for the Redeemer and the Saints; to the desire of expiating sin, and to the hope of eternal life."[1]

Council of Piacenza (1095)

When Europe had been prepared for action by the preaching of Peter the Hermit, Urban II. held a council, at Piacenza, in Italy, on the 1st of March, 1095, to make immediate preparation for the organization of a crusade. Ambassadors attended from the Byzantine emperor, to plead the cause of the East, while the Western Church was represented by the Pope, two hundred bishops, four thousand abbots and priests, and thirty thousand laymen.[2] Many of those present bound themselves by oath to go to the East. But the solemn inauguration of the Crusades was fittingly reserved for Urban's native land, the home of Christian chivalry.

Council of Clermont (1095),

A largely attended council was held at Clermont, towards the end of the same year, at which Urban presided. In addressing those present, after Peter the Hermit, the

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 231.

[2] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vi., part ii., 1713.

Pope pleaded the cause of the East in words of zeal and eloquence. "Go forth," he cried,[1] "and God will be with you. Turn against the enemies of the Christian name the weapons which you have stained with mutual slaughter. Redeem your sins by your obedience—your rapine, your burnings, your bloodshed. Let the famous nation of the Franks display their valour in a cause where death is the pledge of bliss. Esteem it a privilege to die for Christ where Christ died for you. Think not of kindred or home; you owe God a higher love; for a Christian, every place is exile, every place is home and country." At the conclusion of this solemn appeal, the assembled multitude cried out, as with voice:—"*It is the will of God;*"[2] and thousands,[3] taking the cross, bound themselves to engage in the Holy War. "Never perhaps," says Milman,[4] "did a single speech of man work such extraordinary and lasting results as that of Urban II., at the Council of Clermont."

Urban's address.

As additional inducements to persons to engage in the Crusades, a plenary indulgence[5] was granted to all[6] who

Privileges granted to the Crusaders.

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.* vi., part ii., 1725. Various versions of this speech are given by different writers. See Michaud, i. 49.

[2] This became the war-cry of the Crusaders.

[3] Urban II., in writing to Alexius, says, that as many as 300,000 took the cross. Migne, *Latin Patrol.*, cli. 406.

[4] *Latin Christianity*, iii. 232.

[5] "*Plenary Indulgence,*" says Robertson (v. 387), "*i.e.*, forgiveness, not of particular sins, but of all, was now for the first time introduced." This is a fair illustration of the misrepresentation to which Catholic teaching is so often subjected by Protestant writers. In the first place, a Plenary Indulgence does not mean the remission of sin at all, but of the temporal punishment due to sin. And secondly, the principle of Plenary Indulgences was admitted, as we have already seen (i. 86), in the Church from the earliest times.

[6] "Quicumque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniae adeptione ad liberandam ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit iter illud pro omni poenitentia reputetur."—Can. 2; Hard., vi., part ii., 1718.

took the cross from the sole desire of pleasing God; and a decree was passed, taking themselves and their property[1] under the protection of the Church till their return from the Holy Land.

The religious enthusiasm aroused at Clermont rapidly spread over Europe and communicated itself to all classes, rich and poor, young and old, lay and cleric.

The Knights Crusade starts for the East

The First Crusade started early in the year 1097,[2] to the number of about 600,000 fighting men, under the lead of Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lorraine, who was descended through his mother from Charlemagne. He was accompanied by other distinguished leaders, such as his brother Baldwin, Count of Flanders; Robert, Duke of Normandy; Raymond, Count of Toulouse; and Bohemund, Prince of Tarentum. All the Christian nations of Europe were well represented, except Spain, which had too much to do in struggling with the Mohammedans nearer home. As no king took part in this Crusade, it is frequently spoken of as the *Knights' Crusade.*

Capture of Nice (1097)

Having passed into Asia Minor by Constantinople, the Crusaders attacked Nice, the capital of the Sultan Soliman's dominions, and succeeded in capturing the city (June 20, 1097) after a siege of five weeks. They shortly afterwards defeated the Mohammedans, at Dorylaeum, in Phrygia, which decided the supremacy of Asia

---

[1] "Interim vero eos qui ardore fidei ad expugnandos illos (scil. infidelcs) laborem assumpserint, sub ecclesiae defensione et Beatorum Petri et Pauli protectione tamquam verae obedientiae filios recipimus, et ab universis inquietationibus tam in rebus quam in personis statuimus manere securos." Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vi., part ii., 1725.

[2] In the interval between the Council of Clermont and 1097, four large contingents set out for the East under the lead of Walter the Penniless, Peter the Hermit, and others; but they never reached their destination.

Minor in their favour. At the request of some Christians residing at Edessa, Baldwin went thither at the head of a large body of troops, and founded a Latin Principality in Mesopotamia, with Edessa as its capital. Latin Principality of Edessa.

Having crossed into Syria they laid siege to Antioch, the chief stronghold of the Mohammedans in that country. The city held out for eight months, during which time the besiegers and the besieged suffered severely from hunger, disease, and the sword. The Crusaders at length got possession of Antioch on the 2nd of June, 1098; but only to be besieged in turn by a large force of Turks sent to the assistance of their co-religious. The defeat of the latter, about four weeks later, made the Latins masters of Syria. Here a Christian Principality was founded with Bohemund as its ruler. Latin Principality of Antioch (1098).

The Crusaders remained at Antioch during the following winter to recruit their strength after the sufferings of the recent sieges. They[1] set out for Jerusalem in the month of March, their numbers having been reduced to about 40,000 fighting men; and arrived in view of the Holy City on the 6th of June, 1099, when they prostrated themselves to the ground, exclaiming: "Jerusalem! Jerusalem!" They proceeded immediately to attack the city, which was taken after an obstinate siege of forty days, on Friday, the 15th of July, at 3 o'clock, p.m. Jerusalem taken (1099).

Godfrey was saluted by his followers as King of Jerusalem. But refusing to accept the title, or to wear a crown of gold where the Saviour had worn one of thorns, Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.

[1] They were accompanied by Peter the Hermit, who had joined them in Asia Minor. Shortly after the capture of Jerusalem, Peter returned to Europe, and spent the remaining years of his life (1100-1115) in a monastery founded by him at Huy, near Liège.

he proclaimed himself merely Protector of the Holy Sepulchre.[1] Thus was founded the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, the third of the Christian Principalities established by the Crusaders in the East. It comprised, at first, little more than the Holy City. But it soon extended over the whole of Palestine. On the death of Godfrey, in 1100, he was succeeded by his brother Baldwin of Edessa.

Second Crusade (1147-49).

The conquest of the Latin Principality of Edessa by the Mohammedans, in 1144, gave rise to the Second Crusade. It was preached by St. Bernard, at the command of Eugene III. (1145-53); hence it has been frequently styled St. Bernard's Crusade. Two expeditions[2] started for the East, in 1147, under the leadership of Conrad III. (1138-52), Emperor of Germany, and Louis VII. of France (1137-80). They turned out to be complete failures, owing partly to the treachery of the Greeks,[3] and partly to dissensions among the leaders. The Germans suffered a severe defeat near Iconium from the Turks, who were said to have been incited to attack them by the Greek Emperor. Most of the survivors returned to Europe. Conrad, who had taken refuge in Constantinople, went afterwards to Jerusalem as a simple pilgrim. Here he was joined, in June, 1148, by those of the French Crusaders who had survived the hardships and reverses they had met with in Asia Minor and Syria. An attack was planned on Damascus, which ended in complete disaster for the Crusaders. Conrad and Louis returned to Europe in 1149,

Its failure.

---

[1] Michaud, *Hist. of the Crusades*, i. 235.

[2] The Crusaders, according to Gibbon (iv. 153), numbered about 400,000.

[3] For an account of their treachery at Constantinople and in Asia Minor, see Michaud, *Hist. of Crusades*, i. 348-52.

accompanied by only a miserable remnant of the magnificent armies they had led to the East.

Indignation against St. Bernard.

The indignation aroused throughout Europe by the failure of the Crusade, and the immense loss of human life, found expression in the unstinted abuse heaped on St. Bernard for having organized the expedition and promised it success. He bore the reproaches directed against him with patience ; and justified himself by saying that he had acted in accordance with the will of God, as shown by the numerous miracles he had performed in proof of his mission. The disasters of the Crusaders he ascribed to their sins ; and in support of his contention he appealed to the exclusion of the Jews for many years from the Land of Promise because of their unworthiness.[1]

Third Crusade (1189-92).

The capture of Jerusalem, in 1187, by Saladin,[2] a young Kurdish[3] chief, who had recently conquered Egypt, aroused once more the martial spirit of Europe. The Third Crusade was organized by the most renowned warriors of their age ; viz., Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, Philip Augustus of France, and Richard Cœur-de-Lion of England. The numbers who took part in it, as well as the character of the leaders, inspired the highest hopes of success. But these hopes were destined to disappointment, owing to the same causes that had proved fatal to the last Crusade. The German contingent set out for the East under the command of the Emperor early in the year 1189. Having crossed the Hellespont, to the number

---

[1] *De Consideratione*, ii., c. 1.

[2] Hence the name of the Saladin Tax, imposed at this time on the ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, for the holy wars.

[3] The Kurds inhabited a tract of country lying between Armenia and the Tigris.

The German Crusaders.

of 83,000 men, they defeated the Mohammedans near Iconium.[1] But, unfortunately for the success of the expedition, Frederick died shortly afterwards (June 10th, 1190), from a chill caught while bathing in the river Selef,[2] in Cilicia. The German Crusaders, being thus deprived of the only one who could maintain unity and military discipline, split up into a number of sections. Some of them returned to Europe; others went to Antioch, where most of them fell victims to disease; while the rest, under the command of Barbarossa's youthful son, Frederick,[3] went to Acre to assist the Christians, who were engaged in besieging that city.

The French and English Crusaders.

The French and English contingents, strengthened by Crusaders from other countries, started by sea for Palestine about midsummer, 1190. Hearing that Acre was being attached by the Christians, they directed their course thither. The city surrendered to the united forces of the

Capture of Acre (1191).

Crusaders on the 12th of June, 1191, after a siege of two years. Its surrender, however, became merely the occasion of bringing into greater prominence the divisions that had for some time existed between the Christian leaders. We are told, for instance, that Richard of England insulted Leopold[4] of Austria by pulling down his banner, which had been placed on one of the towers, and trampling on it, as unworthy to stand beside those of kings; while the old

---

[1] The capital of the Mohammedan kingdom in Asia Minor after the capture of Nice by the Crusaders.

[2] Some say he was drowned. Gibbon, iv. 156. Many writers make Frederick perish in the river Cydnus, near Tarsus, in which Alexander the Great had nearly met with a like fate. Michaud, i. 449.

[3] He died shortly after his arrival at Acre.

[4] The leader of the Germans after the death of the younger Frederick.

national jealousy between England and France was intensified by quarrels between Richard and Philip about the possession of Cyprus.

These divisions were fatal to the success of the Crusade. The Germans and most of the French soldiers under the command of their king returned to Europe. Richard continued his stay in the East for a year longer, during which he performed prodigies[1] of valour, and added the cities of Cæsarea and Jaffa to the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Finding it impossible with the forces at his disposal to recapture Jerusalem, he entered into a truce[2] of three years and eight months with Saladin, during which all hostilities were to be suspended, and Christians allowed to visit Jerusalem free of taxes and molestation of every kind.

Richard Cœur de Lion concludes a truce with Salad (1192).

On his way back to England, Richard was taken captive by Leopold of Austria, who handed him over to Henry VI. of Germany. The latter had him cast into prison, from which he was released (March 1194), after a confinement of fourteen months, on engaging to pay a large ransom.[3] Owing to the interference of Celestine III., Henry promised shortly before his death to make restitution to the King of England. But his promise was never fully carried out.

Richard taken prisoner by Leopold of Austria.

What is generally reckoned as the Fourth Crusade has no other claim to the title than that derived from its

Fourth Crusade (1202-4).

---

[1] "His tremendous name," says Gibbon (iv. 168), "was employed by the Saracen mothers to silence their infants; and if a horse was suddenly started from the way, his rider was wont to exclaim; 'Dost thou think King Richard is in that bush?'"

[2] Michaud, i. 500.

[3] 100,000 marks, of which 80,000 were actually paid, the rest being remitted owing to the intercession of the Pope. Lingard, ii. 280.

original aim. It was organized by Innocent III., who laboured indefatigably from the very commencement of his pontificate to reverse the recent disasters of the Christians in the East. He commissioned Fulco, the pastor of Neuilly, who was held in high repute for his eloquence as well as for his power of working miracles, to preach the Crusade in France. The preaching of Fulco was attended with remarkable success, as he enlisted we are told,[1] as many as 200,000 in the cause of the Holy War.

Crusaders assist the Venetians in recovering Zara.

The Crusaders set out for the East, early in the year 1202, under the lead of Baldwin, Count of Flanders. Unfortunately, however, for the success of the expedition, they allowed themselves to be diverted from their main, purpose by selfish and designing men. In the first place their services were secured by Dandolo, Doge of Venice, in recovering Zara,[2] a town in Dalmatia, in part payment for a fleet to convey them to Asia. And they became involved immediately afterwards (1203) in the quarrels between the rival claimants to the Byzantine throne. Isaac Angelus, the rightful ruler, had been dethroned in 1195 by his brother, Alexius Angelus, and deprived of his sight. At the urgent entreaty of his fugitive son, the Crusaders went to Constantinople, and restored Isaac to the throne. But scarcely had they taken their departure from the city, when he was again dethroned by Alexius Ducas, and his son cruelly murdered in prison.[3] Ducas was, however, soon obliged to fly, and was succeeded by Lascaris. When the Crusaders learned what had occurred,

Latin Kingdom of Constantinople (1204-61).

[1] Hurter, *Life of Innocent III.*, i. 450.

[2] It had been recently taken from the Republic by the King of Hungary.

[3] Isaac Angelus, on hearing the death of his son, died of terror and despair. Michaud, ii. 118.

they returned, and, having deposed the usurper, established the Latin Kingdom of Constantinople (1204-61), with Baldwin as its first sovereign. Thus ended the Fourth Crusade, without having done anything to assist the Christians in the East.

Fifth Crusade (1218-20).

The failure of the last Crusade did not dishearten Innocent, who continued to labour energetically till the end of his life to arouse the Christians of Europe to renewed efforts in the cause of their persecuted brethren in Palestine. His project was approved by the fourth General Council of Lateran, and was warmly taken up by his successor, Honorius III., who succeeded in organizing the Fifth Crusade. In accordance with the plans laid down by the fathers of Lateran, the main body of the Crusaders directed their course (1218)[1] to Egypt, under the command of John of Brienne, who had married (1210) Iolanthe, heiress to the kingdom of Jerusalem. They succeeded in wresting Damietta[2] from the hands of the infidels, towards the end of the year 1219, after a siege of seventeen months. But a pestilence which shortly afterwards made its appearance among them, reduced their numbers considerably, and compelled them to abandon the idea of conquering Egypt. A truce of eight years was concluded in 1220, by which Damietta was restored to the Mohammedans,

Damietta taken (1219).

Truce entered into with the Mohammedans.

[1] Different contingents of Crusaders had set out for Acre during the previous year, 1217, led by Andrew II. of Hungary, the Duke of Bavaria, and the Duke of Austria, &c. After marching through various parts of Palestine they attacked the infidel stronghold on Mount Thabor. But being repulsed they returned to Acre, and shortly afterwards to Europe, without effecting anything towards the deliverance of the Holy Places. Michaud, ii. 225-30.

[2] Modern Damietta is about five miles from Damietta of the Crusades, which was burned in 1270.

and the prisoners on both sides set at liberty. Most of the surviving Crusaders forthwith returned to Europe.

The remaining Crusades. Fall of Acre (1291).

The history of the Sixth Crusade (1228-30) has been told in connection with Frederick II.; while that of the Seventh (1248-50) and Eighth (1270) has been treated of under the head of Louis IX. Acre, the last great stronghold of the Christians in the East, was captured in 1291, after which the few other places still remaining in their hands were immediately taken possession of by the victorious Mussulmans. And thus disappeared the last traces of the Latin power in the East after a war extending over almost two centuries.

Anti-Catholic writers on the Crusades.

The Crusades have been frequently attacked by anti-Catholic writers from the time of the Waldenses down to our own time, as unjust wars, organized by the Popes for their own selfish purposes.

The Crusades defended against the charge of injustice.

Against the charge of injustice, it is sufficient to state that the Crusades were undertaken in the interests of humanity, charity, and religion, to protect the Christians of the East against oppression by the infidels, and to prevent the desecration of the Holy Places so dear to the heart of every Christian. It should be borne in mind that the original purpose of the Holy Wars was not the conquest of Palestine, but merely the protection of the Eastern Christians against the enemies of the faith. It was only in course of time, when compacts with the Turks, who were themselves but usurpers, were found to be impracticable, that the original scope of the Crusaders developed into the conquest of the Holy Land. "The charge of injustice," says Robertson,[1] "is a refinement which it is even now

[1] iv. 414

difficult to understand, and which would not have occurred to either the assailants or the assailed in an age when the feeling of local religion was as strong in the Christian as in the Jew or the Moslem—when the Christians regarded the Holy Places of the East as an inheritance of which they had been wrongfully despoiled, and which they could not without disgrace, or even sin, leave in the hands of unbelievers. But, in truth, the Crusades were rather defensive than aggressive. They were occasioned by the advance of new tribes, which, with the religion of Mohammed had taken up that spirit of conquest which had cooled and died away among the older Mohammedan nations."

The Crusades not to be condemned because of some abuses.

There were, no doubt, some abuses connected with the Crusades, owing chiefly to the number of those who engaged in them from avarice, ambition, or some other unworthy motive. While strongly reprobating those abuses, we must remember that the character of any great movement is determined not by accidental defects, but by the end at which it aims, and the means by which it is sought to attain that end. Judged by this standard, the Crusades[1] were the most just and sacred wars ever undertaken.

The Popes not guilty of selfishness

That the Popes should have taken a leading part in organizing such wars, is what we should expect from their position as the heads of Christendom. That they were influenced by selfish and political motives, is a charge as unjust as it is untrue. They interfered only when the appeals for help from the East and the enthusiasm of Latin Christendom would no longer allow them to remain quiet. "The Crusades," writes Michaud,[2] "owed their birth and growth

[1] Michaud judiciously remarks (iii. 253) that had the Crusades been successful, the views of Voltaire and the others who have written against them would have been quite different.

[2] *History of the Crusades*, ii. 36.

to the religious and warlike enthusiasm that animated the nations of the West in the twelfth century; and, without this enthusiasm, which was not the work of the heads of the Church, the preaching of the Holy See would not have been able to collect a single army under the banner of the Cross. It may be further added, that during the Holy Wars the Sovereign Pontiffs were frequently driven from Rome and despoiled of their States; and they never summoned the Crusaders to the defence of their power or States of the Church."

Good effects of the Crusades.

The Crusades, while costing Europe much blood and money, conferred on it permanent benefits[1] which far outweighed the temporary losses it sustained.

(a) Christian warfare ennobled.

First: they elevated and ennobled Christian warfare. The chieftains of Europe, who had hitherto been frequently engaged in strife with one another to avenge an insult or extend their power, too often sought to attain their end by every means at their disposal, regardless of its lawfulness. But when they entered on the Sacred Wars, they were taught to fight for humanity and charity, and to adopt the methods of warfare recognised by religion. "To the Crusades," says Dr. Trench,[2] "to the high thoughts which they kindled in so many hearts, and to the religious consecration which they gave to the bearing of arms, we are indebted for some of the fairest aspects of chivalry, as it survives a potent and elevating tradition to the present day. Thus, to them we owe the stately courtesies of gallant foes, able to understand and respect one another,

[1] For a full account of the advantages conferred on Europe by the Crusades, see Michaud, iii. 251-348; and Heeren, *Sur l'Influence des Croisades*. Paris, 1808.

[2] *Lectures on Med. Ch. History*, 147.

with much else that has lifted up modern warfare into something better than a mere mutual butchery, even into a school of honour in which some of the gentlest and noblest of men have been trained."

(*b*) Religion benefited.

Secondly: they were beneficial to the interests of religion. For they stimulated the faith of Christians by bringing them into contact with scenes where the mysteries of their Redemption were accomplished, and thereby acted as a check on the spread of infidelity; while the increased influence accruing to the Popes from their being the chief organizers and directors of the Crusades, enabled them to secure the independence of the Church, to the great advantage of religion and civilization.

(*c*) The political condition of Europe improved.

Thirdly: they were of the utmost political advantage to Europe, for they made Christians feel that they were members of one family, bound together, not merely by their faith, but also by their common opposition to the infidel; and thus diminished the number of petty feuds and wars that had been of such frequent occurrence. And they postponed the invasion of the West by the Turks to a later date, when the Christian nations were better able to repel their attacks. Who can say what would have been the result, had Europe, divided as it was at the time, been invaded by Mohammedan hordes from Asia, urged on by the spirit of conquest, and the fanaticism of recent converts to the faith of Islam.

(*d*) Impetus given to commerce.

Fourthly: they were also most beneficial to the social and commercial condition of the West, by inflicting a death-blow on the feudal system, which was so much opposed to the liberty[1] of the subject; and by extending the

[1] Slaves on taking the cross obtained their freedom.

commercial relations between the East and the West, as well as between different countries of the West. To the Crusades and the impetus which they gave to nautical enterprise, the great medieval cities of Europe, Venice, Genoa, Florence, &c., owed their importance.

Fifthly: they promoted the study of the arts, sciences, and literature in general by bringing the Europeans in contact with the Greeks and Arabs, who were much more proficient than themselves in these departments. The specimens of architecture, sculpture, and painting, witnessed by the Crusaders in the Greek Churches and Mohammedan mosques, stimulated the cultivation of these arts in the West; while the study of the Greek and Arabic languages opened up to them new fields of knowledge. Where would the great medieval cathedrals, "the despair of modern art," be, if the Christians of the West had not been brought in contact with the architecture of the East? And would Scholasticism ever have attained the perfection which it did, had not the works of Aristotle, freed from the errors of the Mohammedans, been introduced into the West by the Crusaders?

(*e*) Study of the arts and sciences stimulated.

CHAPTER IX.

NEW RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

Their general character.

IN no way did the great religious revival, brought about by Hildebrand, make itself more manifest than in the numerous Orders, founded within a century and a-half after his death. Some of them, like the older Orders, were contemplative, having for their immediate object the sanctification of their members; while the majority were founded to render assistance to those in want. Of these latter, some were devoted to the care of the sick and Christian captives; others, to the protection of pilgrims; and others, in fine, to the instruction of the people both by word and example. Hence, we shall treat of the new Orders of this epoch under four heads, viz.—(*a*) the Contemplative Orders; (*b*) the Orders of Mercy; (*c*) the Military Orders; and (*d*) the Mendicant Orders.

A.—THE CONTEMPLATIVE ORDERS.

Their chief purpose.

The Contemplative Orders sought the sanctification of their members by meditation and other ascetical exercises within their monastic enclosures. It frequently happened, as we know from the history of the Church, that the religious of such Orders played the part of great missionaries by preaching the Gospel to unbelievers. But this was merely accidental, not being included in the original scope of religious life. The chief Contemplative Orders founded

during this epoch were the Grammontans, the Cistercians, the Carthusians, and the Premonstratensians.

§ 1. *The Order of Grammont.*

Early life of Stephen.

This Order was founded by Stephen, son of the Count of Thiers, in Auvergne. He was born in 1045; and, at the age of twelve, accompanied his father on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Nicholas[1] at Bari, in Apulia. Falling ill, on his way back to France, he was entrusted to the care of his countryman, Milo, who was Archbishop of Benevento. During his stay here he paid a visit to a neighbouring monastery, and having become enamoured with the manner of life that he witnessed there, he embraced the religious state in Rome.

He founds a new Order (1076).

In 1074, he obtained permission to found a new Order, from Gregory VII., who at the same time expressed a hope that his followers would become as numerous as the stars of heaven. He forthwith returned to his native country, and settled down (1076) at Muret, near Limoges, where he constructed a rude hut for his residence; and putting on a ring, the only article he had preserved from his former possessions, he dedicated himself to the service of the Holy Trinity.[2]

---

[1] St. Nicholas, a native of Lycia, in Asia, was appointed Archbishop of Myra, in his native country. He is said to have been a confessor for the faith during the Diocletian persecution, and to have been present at the Council of Nice. He was so much admired for his piety and great charity that many churches were raised in his honour, immediately after his death (about 342) throughout Christendom. His relics were conveyed to Bari, in 1037, by some merchants from that city who had visited the East.

[2] Gerard, *Life of Stephen*, 12. Gerard was the seventh prior of Grammont. His work is the chief source of our information regarding Stephen's life.

His solitude was soon besieged by holy souls anxious to place themselves under his spiritual guidance. After spending forty-eight years here, in the practice of the most extreme austerities, he passed to his reward, in 1124, at the advanced age of eighty. Shortly after his death, Muret was claimed by a neighbouring monastery of Benedictines. His followers abandoned the ground without any contention, and withdrew to Grammont, about five miles distant, from which the Order takes its name.

His followers withdraw to Grammont.

The rule followed by the Order of Grammont, consisting of seventy-five chapters, was based, according to the generally received opinion, on that of St. Benedict, which is said to have been recommended to Stephen by Gregory VII. Some[1] hold that it was written by the founder of the Order; while others[2] maintain that it was compiled by one of his successors, named Stephen of Lisiac, in 1141. It was very strict, and enjoined poverty and obedience as the foundation of religious life.

The Rule of Grammont.

To ensure the observance of poverty, the religious of Grammont were not allowed to possess any cattle or lands outside their monastic precincts; and to guard against the spirit of avarice, the administration of the temporal affairs of the Order was vested in the hands of lay brothers. But these precautions failed to attain their purpose. The Grammontans soon became possessed of immense wealth which was often appropriated by its administrators. This was the cause of repeated quarrels between the monks and

Quarrels between the religious and lay brothers.

---

[1] *v.g.*, Martene (*Coll. Ampliss.*, vi. 20), who is also of opinion that the rule of Grammont was not based on the Benedictine.

[2] *v.g.*, Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, v. 100.

lay brothers, which brought discredit[1] on the Order, and eventually led to its decline.

§ 2. *The Cistercian Order.*

Monastery founded at Citeaux by Robert of Molesme (1098).

The Cistercian, the most popular of the new Contemplative Orders, was founded in 1098, by Robert, Abbot of Molesme. Failing in his efforts to reform some abuses that had crept into his monastery, he removed, in company with twenty of his monks, to Citeaux (Cistercium) near Dijon. Here he opened a house, in which the rule of St. Benedict was strictly observed, some special constitutions, suggested by the needs of the times, being added. The monks were commanded to yield a ready obedience to the bishop of the diocese in which they lived, and were prohibited to interfere with the work of secular priests. General chapters, at which all abbots were required to attend, either personally or by proxy, were to be held annually, and were to form a part of the regular government of the Order.

He returns to Molesme (1099).

On the departure of Robert from Molesme, the condition of the monastery was daily growing worse. Some of the monks petitioned[2] Urban II. for his return. Owing to the interference of the Pope, Robert resumed his former office at Molesme in 1099, and continued to labour here energetically in the interests of monastic discipline until his death, in 1110.

The constitutions of the Order were committed to

---

[1] Thus, Innocent III., in writing to the Cistercians warns them against dissension, "ne forte, sicut Grandimontenses in derisum et fabulam incidant." Ep. v. 109.

[2] See Urban's letter to Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, Ep. xx. Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, vol. cli., 545.

writing by Robert's successor, Alberic, and were perfected in 1119, by the adoption of the *Charter of Charity*,[1] drawn up by an Englishman named Stephen Harding, which required that the monks should be directed in all their actions by charity, and cultivate towards one another a spirit of brotherly love. Constitutions of the new Order

The constitutions were approved the same year by Calixtus II., and supplied elements of strength and security to the new Order hitherto unknown in the religious life of the West. While the old Benedictine rule left each monastery practically independent, the *Charter of Charity* required that the abbot of each mother house should, either personally or by his representative, make an annual visitation of its dependencies, to see that monastic discipline was strictly observed; and even the Abbey of Citeaux itself was subject to a like supervision by the abbots of La Ferte, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond.

The colour of the Cistercian habit, which was originally black, was changed to white by Alberic, to typify the innocence to which they should aspire, and the joy which was to be their portion. This gave offence to the older Orders, in all of which, with the exception of the Camaldolites, who were unknown in France, black was the colour used as a sign of penance and humility.

The new order was considered so severe, that for fifteen years after its foundation, it was not joined by a single new recruit. In 1113, however, it received a valuable accession in the person of St. Bernard, the fame of whose piety and learning contributed largely to its *St. Bernard.*

[1] It consisted of thirty articles. Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, clxxxii. 50.

rapid spread and the world-wide celebrity it enjoyed for centuries.[1]

His early life.

This remarkable man was born of noble and pious parents at Fontaines, near Dijon, in 1091. His mother Alice was most careful about the early training of her children—six sons and one daughter—all of whom she dedicated in their infancy to the service of God. She took special pains to prepare her third son, Bernard, for the great mission for which, as made known to her in vision, he had been destined by God. He was sent at an early age to Chatillon on the Seine, to be educated for the priesthood. While here he gave ample evidence of his solid piety and great intellectual abilities.

Dangers to his virtue.

On the death of his mother (about 1105),[2] he returned to his father's house. During his stay here he became acquainted with some young men whose company threatened for a time to prove fatal to his virtue. But strengthened by grace and the early lessons he had learned at his mother's knees, he overcame the temptations to which he had been exposed, and resolved to abandon a world that was so full of danger and corruption. His brothers, at first, endeavoured to dissuade him from carrying out his purpose; but, so far were they from succeeding, that after a short time they also came to a like resolution.

He becomes a religious in Citeaux (1113).

At length, in 1113, accompanied by thirty young men, of whom five were his brothers,[3] St. Bernard embraced

---

[1] St. Bernard is, therefore, spoken of by Milman (iii., 332) as "the true founder of the Cistercian Order."

[2] *Chronologia Bernardina*, Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, vol. clxxxii. 52.

[3] The youngest, we are told, came to the resolution of becoming a religious on the day of the departure of St. Bernard and his other brothers. The eldest in parting with the youngest congratulated him on being left sole

the religious state in the Abbey of Citeaux. In a very short time his fame attracted a large number of postulants to his Order; and it soon became necessary to found new monasteries to afford accommodation to the rapidly increasing number of members. Of these the four first founded (1113-15) were La Ferte, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond, which are known in history as the Eldest Daughters of Citeaux. They had the chief part in the government of the Order, and became in turn the mother houses of numerous other monasteries.

The Monastery of Clairvaux, the most famous of the Eldest Daughters, was founded in 1115. In that year, St. Bernard, leaving Citeaux with twelve monks, directed his steps to a place known as the Valley of Wormwood, a favourite haunt of robbers. Having cleared the valley—hence called Clairvaux (Clara Vallis)—he erected a monastery of which he was consecrated abbot by his friend William of Champeaux, Bishop of Chalons. Here he spent his time in prayer, study, and the practice of the most extreme austerities. "He prayed standing, until his knees and his feet failed him through weariness; he fasted until his digestion was so deranged that to eat was a torture to him; and he grudged the scanty time which he allowed himself for sleep, as being wasted in a state of death."[1] William of Champeaux, fearing that his mortifications would prove

Founds the Monastery of Clairvaux (1115).

His austerities.

---

heir to his father's possessions. Upon which the latter replied: "Is it heaven for you, and earth for me!" and immediately resolved to join the happy band.

His sister Humbeline, who was married at the time, became a religious shortly afterwards; and is said to have been the foundress of the Cistercian nuns, known in France as the Bernardines.

[1] *Rob.*, v. 76.

fatal to his health, used his influence to secure a mitigation of their severity.[1]

Popularity of the new Order.

The religious of Clairvaux, influenced by the example of their holy abbot, became models of every virtue. The fame of their sanctity soon spread far and wide, and attracted a large number of applicants to their institute; while petitions poured in on St. Bernard from bishops in almost every part of Europe, asking for some of his monks to be sent to their dioceses to found monasteries. The Order spread with wonderful rapidity. We are assured that before it was fifty years old it had over five hundred houses[2] in different parts of Latin Christendom.[3]

Influence of St. Bernard.

St. Bernard was the most remarkable man of his century, and possessed an influence which no ecclesiastic before or since his time has attained. While loving the solitude of the cloister, which he never left, except when obliged in the interests of religion, he took part in every great movement of his time. In the schism of Peter Leonis, he was chiefly instrumental in securing the recognition of Innocent II. as the lawful Pope: he organized the Second Crusade: he was consulted on all important questions of Church and State, by popes, emperors, and kings: he successfully combated the false rationalism of Abelard: he was the father of scholastic mysticism: finally, he

---

[1] *Vita Prima*, i. 33.

[2] Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, 395.

[3] The Order was introduced into Ireland by monks from Clairvaux, at the request of St. Malachy, who was a great friend of St. Bernard. There were twenty-three Cistercian monasteries in the country before the end of the twelfth century, of which the most remarkable were Mellifont, the first founded (1144), Bectiff, Holy Cross, Jerpoint, Dunbrody, and Baltinglass. There were forty-two houses of the Order in Ireland at the beginning of the sixteenth century. See Introduction to the *Triumphalia Chronologica Monasterii Sanctae Crucis in Hibernia*, edited with notes, by the Rev. D. Murphy, S.J.

preached against the heretics in the south of France, thousands of whom were won back to the Church by his eloquence, miracles, and holy example.

His writings

Notwithstanding his numerous and varied occupations, he was a prolific writer. His best known works were his treatise *On Meditation*, *Apology for the Cistercians*, *On the Love of God*, *On Grace and Free-Will*, and *On the Errors of Abelard*.[1] The first of these was written for his friend Eugene III., who had been formerly a monk of Clairvaux, to impress on him the necessity of not allowing his multifarious public duties to interfere with his religious exercises. His *Apology for the Cistercians*, addressed to William Abbot of St. Thierry, was written in answer to the charges brought against his religious by the Clugniacs on account of their dress and the severity of their rule. Though entitled an *Apology*, it contains severe strictures on the excesses that had been recently allowed to make their appearance in the great rival congregation. We must, however, bear in mind that it was written at a time when the discipline of Clugny had suffered much from the laxness of one of its abbots named Pontius (1109-22). But his successor, Peter the Venerable (1122-56), laboured energetically to repair the evils of the late administration ; and replied[2] at length to the charges brought by St. Bernard against his monks.

His death (1153).

Episcopal and other dignities were offered to St. Bernard but he resolutely refused to accept them, preferring to die, as he had lived, a simple monk of Clairvaux. Here he passed to his reward, in 1153, after having impressed his character on every great movement of his age.

---

[1] Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers* (Dublin, 1724), vol. ii., page 306.

[2] For extracts from St. Bernard's *Apology*, and Peter's reply, see Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, 407-79.

§ 3. *The Carthusian Order.*

Bruno, a canon of Cologne.

Bruno, the founder of this Order, was born in Cologne about the year 1030. He became successively canon[1] in his native city and director of the cathedral school at Rheims, where he had as one of his pupils, Otho, who afterwards became Pope, under the name of Urban II. Having grown weary of the world, and disgusted at the disedifying life of Manasses,[2] Archbishop of Rheims, who is said[3] to have declared that his see would be very desirable but for the obligation attached to it of saying Mass, he withdrew,[4] in 1084,[5] along with six companions, to a rocky and mountainous retreat near Grenoble, called Chartreuse[6] (Carthusium).

He withdraws to Chartreuse (1084).

In this solitude Bruno laid the foundation of a new Order, stricter in its discipline than any hitherto known.

---

[1] *Acta Sti. Brunonis*, page 36; Migne, *Lat Patrol.*, vol. clii.

[2] He was deposed by Gregory VII., in 1080.

[3] *Acta Sanct.*, I., page 516.

[4] According to many writers who accept an ancient tradition, mentioned for the first time by writers of the fourteenth century, the immediate cause of his withdrawal was a remarkable occurrence said to have taken place at a requiem office. While the circumstances are variously described by different authorities, they all appear to agree regarding the substance of the story, viz., that as the office of a deceased Paris doctor, who had been held in high repute for his piety, was being celebrated, the corpse raised itself in the coffin thrice, saying: "By the just judgment of God I am accused;" "by the just judgment of God I am found guilty;" "by the just judgment of God I am condemned." The story was rejected as devoid of foundation by the learned Launoy, in his *De Vera Causa Secessus Sti. Brunonis in Eremum* (Paris, 1622). It was inserted in the Lessons of the second Nocturn of St. Bruno's Office, authorized by Gregory XV. (1621-23); but was expunged by Urban VIII. (1623-44). For full inquiry into the truth of the story, see the *Acts of St. Bruno* (108-215), in *Lat. Patrol.*, clii.

[5] Mabillon, *Acta. Ben.*, ix. 86.

[6] The monasteries of the Order in England were generally known as Charter-houses.

The monks lived in separate cells, and never met except at the public offices of the Church. They followed the Benedictine rule as far as it was compatible with their anchoretic mode of life, and added numerous constitutions for the purpose of increasing its severity. The time not required for rest was devoted to prayer and manual labour, those who were qualified being employed in transcribing MSS. They lived mostly on vegetables and coarse bread, flesh meat being strictly prohibited, and fish, eggs, and butter being allowed only on Sundays and Thursdays. They fasted on one meal a-day, except within the octaves of Easter, Christmas, and some other festivals, and observed unbroken silence except on the chief feasts of the year. Their dress is described by Peter the Venerable as so scanty and so rough that the very sight of it would affright one.

Severity of his Order.

The Carthusians used only silver chalices, and excluded all unnecessary display from the service of the Church. Notwithstanding the strict poverty which they practised, they could point to some of their monasteries, *v.g.*, the Grand Chartreuse and Certosa, as the finest in Christendom.

Unnecessary ornamentation excluded.

After spending six years at Chartreuse, St. Bruno went to Rome in 1090, at the request of his former pupil, Urban II., to assist, by his advice, in the government of the Church. But, soon growing weary of the excitement of city life, he obtained permission to withdraw to Calabria, where he founded a new house of his Order, S. Stefano del Bosco. Here he spent his last days in retirement and communion with God, and died in 1101.

St. Bruno goes to Rome (1090).

The customs of the Order were systematized and committed to writing by Guigo the fifth prior[1] of the Grand

Constitutions of the Order reduced to writing.

[1] The Superior of the Grand Chartreuse was known as the Prior of that Monastery, but was General of the whole Order.

Chartreuse, in 1128. Additional statutes were enacted by subsequent general chapters. Owing to the extreme austerities practised by the Carthusians, very few were willing to join them at first. But after the approval of the Order by the Holy See, in 1170, it spread rapidly in France, Italy, and Switzerland. There were nine houses of the Order in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century ; but they soon disappeared with the general downfall of religious life in that country.

Carthusians held in high esteem.

The Carthusians retained, longer than any other Order, the spirit of their founder and the original severity of their rule. Hence Cardinal Bona speaks of them as "the miracles of the world, angels in human flesh;" and even the irreligious Voltaire is compelled to write of them in terms of praise. The esteem in which they have been held by the Church is sufficiently expressed by the privilege accorded to them of receiving members from every other religious Order.[1]

§ 4. *Premonstratensians.*

Early life of St. Norbert.

The founder of this Order was St. Norbert, who was born of noble parents, at Xanten, on the lower Rhine, about 1080. He was dedicated to the service of the altar at an early age; and, after being ordained sub-deacon, was appointed canon in his native diocese, and afterwards almoner in the court of his relative, Henry V. During the earlier portion of his clerical career his conduct was not in keeping with the requirements of his religious profession. He was full of the spirit of the world; led a distracted and

[1] A female branch of the Carthusian Order was founded, in 1229, at Saletto on the Rhone. But, owing to the severity of the rule, it never made much headway. We are told that there were only six Carthusian convents in France at the time of the Revolution.

dissipated life; and looked on his ecclesiastical position merely as the means of securing a livelihood.

He embraces a life of strict asceticism (1114).

An incident occurred in 1114, which was destined to work a great change in his future life. He happened to be riding out one day when he was suddenly overtaken by a thunderstorm. A flash of lightning struck the earth close by, and threw him from his horse, depriving him of consciousness. On regaining the use of reason, he began to muse on his narrow escape from death, and on the fate that would have awaited him had he been then summoned to judgment. As the result of his meditation, he entered on a new life of penance and prayer; and, after two years spent in preparation, received, in 1116, the order of priesthood, which he had hitherto refused, lest it should prove a restraint on his worldly pursuits.

Resigns his ecclesiastical appointments (1118).

His desire to make amends for his past irregularities had not been yet satisfied. In 1118 he resigned his ecclesiastical appointments, and distributed his goods among the poor. Having obtained permission from Gelasius II. to preach the Gospel wherever he wished, he travelled, barefooted and poorly clad, through different parts of France and Germany, preaching the kingdom of God, and condemning the vices and excesses of his age.

New Order founded at Pre montré (1119).

His missionary labours having been attended with the most signal success, Calixtus II. confirmed, at the Council of Rheims (1119) the privilege of preaching he had already enjoyed; and granted him permission to found a new Order. Norbert selected as the site of his first monastery a marshy and secluded valley in the forest of Coucy, near Laon, which had been pointed out to him in a vision—hence called Pre montré (*Pratum Monstratum*). He gave the members of his Order a white woollen garment, said to

have been recommended to him by the Blessed Virgin, and adopted the rule[1] of St. Augustine, to which special constitutions were added to enable the monks to attain the secondary purpose of their institute,[2] viz., the instruction of the people,

Norbert appointed Archbishop of Magdeburg (1126).

In 1126, the clergy of Magdeburg, being unable to agree in the choice of an archbishop, referred the matter to the decision of two Papal legates, who happened to be at Spires attending a diet. St. Norbert, who was also present, was recommended by the legates for the vacant see; and consented, after considerable difficulty, to receive the responsibility. On his arrival in Madgeburg, he was received by the clergy and people with great enthusiasm. But their attitude towards him soon changed, owing to the austerity of his habits and the poverty of his dress. Notwithstanding the opposition which he sometimes experienced, he continued to labour zealously in the cause of religious reform in his diocese till 1134, when he died shortly after his return from Rome, whither he had gone with Lothaire, to assist in restoring Innocent II. to his see.

Rapid spread of the New Order.

The Premonstratensian Order was approved by Honorius II., in 1126, and spread rapidly in France, Germany, and the Netherlands. Some houses of the Order were also founded in England. We are told that at the time of the Reformation, it had as many as fifteen hundred monasteries

---

[1] According to the more generally received opinion, this rule was not drawn up by St. Augustine, though it was based on his writings, especially on his letter (ep. cix.) to the nuns of Hippo.

[2] It is reckoned among the Contemplative Orders, because the sanctification of its members was its principal object.

and five hundred convents in different parts of Christendom.[1]

B.—THE ORDERS OF MERCY.

Their object.

The principal purpose of these Orders was to render assistance to Christians in their corporal necessities. The chief Orders of Mercy founded during this epoch were the Anthonists, the Trinitarians, and the Order of the Blessed Virgin of Mercy.

§ 1. *The Anthonists.*

Gaston and Guerin.

Two wealthy noblemen of Dauphiny, father and son, named Gaston and Guerin, being attacked by a painful disease, known as St. Anthony's Fire,[2] appealed to St. Anthony for assistance. Their appeal having been favourably heard, they resolved, out of gratitude, to use their wealth in establishing a society to look after those

---

[1] Another Contemplative Order of this epoch deserves notice, viz., that of Fontrevaud. Its founder, Robert of Arbrissel, was born near Rennes, in 1047. Having taught theology for some time in Paris, he was appointed assistant bishop in his native diocese, in 1086. But, being opposed by the canons of Rennes in carrying out his scheme of reform, he resigned his position, and withdrew (1094) to a hermitage in the forest of Craon. Here, in company with a few disciples who followed him thither, he entered on a life of extreme mortification.

In the year 1100, he erected two religious houses—one for men and the other for women—at Fontrevaud, on the confines of Maine and Touraine. The new Order was placed under the special protection of the Queen of Heaven, and was approved by Paschal II., in 1106. Within a short time it had numerous houses in France, Spain, and England. Before his death (1117), Robert appointed the abbess of Fontrevaud superioress of the whole Order. In justification of his action, he appealed to the example of our Saviour, who commended St. John to the care of the Blessed Virgin.

[2] It was supposed to have been introduced from the East, and carried away the population of the countries that it visited, at the rate of thousands in the day.

suffering from St. Anthony's Fire and similar diseases. The Society was approved in 1096.

They found an Order to take care of those suffering from special diseases.

The Order was composed at first exclusively of laymen; but, after the time of Boniface VIII., it included priests who followed the rule of St. Augustine. The Anthonists rendered valuable assistance to the poor and afflicted, and won for themselves universal esteem.

§ 2. *The Trinitarians.*

St. John of Matha and St. Felix of Valois.

In the wars that were of such frequent occurrence between the Christians and the Mohammedans, especially in Spain, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, many of the former were taken captive. For the redemption of these captives the Order of the Holy Trinity was founded by St. John of Matha (1169-1213), and St. Felix of Valois (1127-1212). The idea of such a society appears to have first occurred to the former, who was a doctor of Paris; and was suggested to him while saying his first Mass. Immediately after his ordination, he withdrew to a solitude in the diocese of Meaux, where St. Felix, who was descended from the royal house of Valois, was leading the life of a hermit. St. John explained his design to his holy companion, who looked on it as an inspiration from heaven. Having earnestly besought God for enlightenment, the two set out for Rome; and having obtained (1198) the approval of Innocent III., they founded the Order of the Holy Trinity.[1]

They found an Order for the redemption of Christian captives (1198).

The Trinitarians followed the rule of St. Augustine, and wore a white habit, with a red and blue cross on the

[1] They were called Mathurins in France, as the chief house of their Order in that country was built on the site of the chapel of St. Mathurin, in Paris.

breast. Their efficiency was generally recognised after 1201, when the first batch of captives, numbering one hundred and eighty-six arrived in Europe from Africa. They soon became very popular throughout Europe; and had numerous houses in England, Ireland, and Scotland.

§ 3. *The Order of the Blessed Virgin of Mercy.*

St. Peter of Nolasco and St. Raymond of Pennaforte.

This Order, which had practically the same object as the last, was founded at Barcelona, in Spain, in 1223, by St. Peter of Nolasco (1189-1256), a distinguished Frenchman, and his spiritual director, St. Raymond of Pennaforte (1175-1275), a Dominican, and the most learned canonist of his age. Its members bound themselves to give their fortunes, to serve as soldiers, and, if necessary, to sacrifice their liberty, as St. Peter actually did in Africa, for the redemption of Christian captives. They were divided into Knights, who acted as soldiers, and attended in choir when not engaged in military service; and chaplains, who looked after the spiritual interests of the community. St. Raymond secured the approval of the Order by Gregory IX. in 1228.

Their Order approved (1228).

C.—THE MILITARY ORDERS.

Their character

One of the most striking institutions of the Middle Ages was that of Military Orders, which combined the chief elements of the religious and military life. We are told[1] that there were as many as thirty such Orders founded during this epoch, the chief of which were the Knights of St. John, the Knights Templars, and the Teutonic Knights.

---

[1] Chateaubriand (Engl. ed.), 601.

§ 1. *The Knights of St. John.*

Hospice founded at Jerusalem, (1048).

This Order had its origin in a hospice founded at Jerusalem, in 1048, for the accommodation of pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre. The hospice was dedicated to St. John the Baptist. Hence those attending it were generally known as the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John.

Its scope enlarged.

When Jerusalem was taken by the Crusaders, the scope of the Institute was enlarged, the duty of fighting against infidels being added to those of hospitality and the care of the sick. Its members, acting on the advice of Gerard († 1117), the first Superior, took the religious vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. And a rule was drawn up for their guidance, in 1118, by Gerard's successor, Raymond de Puy, which was approved two years later by Calixtus II.

Popularity of the new Order

After its approval the Order became very popular; and was recruited, because of its military character, from most of the noble families of Europe. The members were divided into knights, chaplains, and serving brothers who attended the knights on their military expeditions. They wore a black habit, adorned with a white Maltese Cross (✠) on the breast, and were governed by a grand master, commanders, and chapters of knights. Riches[1] poured in to them in great abundance; and they soon became possessed of houses called Commanderies in most of the southern maritime cities of Europe for the accommodation of pilgrims to the East.

---

[1] Matthew Paris says (Ad an. 1244): "Habent insuper Templarii in Christianitate novem millia maneriorum; Hospitalii vero novem decem, praeter emolumenta et varios proventus ex fraternitatibus et praedicationibus provenientes et per privilegia sua accrescentes."

On the capture of Acre, by the Mohammedans, in 1291, the Knights Hospitallers of St. John sought refuge in Cyprus, where they were kindly received. They shortly afterwards (1310) captured Rhodes and some adjacent islands, which they held till 1523, when they were expelled by the Turks under Soliman. Seven years later they received a grant of the Island of Malta, from Charles V.; hence they are frequently called the Knights of Malta. This Island remained in their possession till it was taken from them by Napoleon, in 1798. This Order is still represented by some houses in Russia and Spain. But the office of Grand Master has not been filled since 1801.

Its history after the fall of Acre.

§ 2. *The Knights Templars.*

This Order was founded about 1118 by Hugh de Payens and eight other French knights, who to the ordinary religious vows added that of defending the Holy Sepulchre, and protecting pilgrims to the Holy Land. They took up their residence in a palace bestowed on them by Baldwin II. of Jerusalem, which was built on portion of the site of the old Temple; hence their name.

Order founded (1118).

Hugh returned to the West in 1127, accompanied by some of his brethren, for the purpose of securing the recognition of his institute as an Order. He succeeded in enlisting in his favour the influence of St. Bernard, who is said to have been a nephew of one of the knights. The latter drew up a rule for their observance, based on that of St. Augustine, and secured the approval of the Order by Honorius II. at the Synod of Troyes, in 1128.

Approved by the Holy See (1128).

The knights were bound to the observance of strict

poverty;[1] to attend at the recitation of the Divine Office daily, unless engaged in military service, when they were to say a certain number of "Our Fathers;" and to abstain from flesh meat on four days of the week, and from milk and eggs on Fridays. Their habit was white, with a red Maltese cross on the breast. The Order consisted originally of knights alone; but after some time priests and serving brothers were added. The fame of the piety and valour of the Templars attracted large numbers to their ranks. They soon acquired vast possessions in different parts of Europe; and had houses in England[2] and Ireland before the end of the twelfth century.

Duties, &c., of the Knights.

Their history after the fall of Acre.

After the fall of Acre they withdrew, at first, to Cyprus, and shortly afterwards to the different countries in which their vast possessions lay. Relaxation of religious discipline, the usual accompaniment of excessive wealth, began to manifest itself among them at an early date, which was soon followed by excesses of a more serious kind. This joined to the quarrels[3] between them and the knights of St. John, as well as the jealousy of the European princes at their immense possessions and their arrogance, stirred up a strong spirit of opposition against them, which culminated in their suppression at the Council of Vienne, in 1312.

---

[1] It is generally supposed that the Seal of the Order, which represents two knights on one horse, was intended to typify their poverty. Some, however, held that it was adopted to symbolize the brotherly love that should prevail among the members of the Order.

[2] One of the first houses in England was that built (1185) at the end of Fleet-street, in London—since known as the Temple: while their first house in Ireland was the priory of Kilmainham, founded in 1174, by Strongbow.

[3] For an account of the quarrels, see Michaud, *History of the Crusades*, ii. 9-10; iii. 2.

§ 3. *The Teutonic Knights.*

Society founded at Acre (1190).

The origin of this Order is somewhat similar to that of the Knights of St. John. During the siege of Acre (1189-91) a charitable society was established by some German merchants from Bremen and Lübeck to take care of their wounded fellow-countrymen, whose wants could be but imperfectly attended to by societies of other nationalities. Their services were so highly appreciated, that Henry VI. of Germany conferred on them the rank of knighthood. They formed themselves into a religious society, taking the same vows as the other military Orders; and were approved by Celestine III., in 1196. They consisted originally of knights alone; but, as in the case of the Knights Templars, priests and serving brothers were afterwards added. Their habit was a white mantle with a black cross.

The Teutonic Knights approved (1196).

The Teutonic Knights withdrew to Europe in the course of the thirteenth century; and having conquered Prussia,[1] Livonia, and other adjacent territories, assisted in establishing Christianity on a firm basis in these countries.

---

[1] Various efforts were made to convert the Pagan Prussians. The first Church missionary who appears to have preached to them was Adalbert of Prague, who was martyred in 997. His successor, a Benedictine monk, named Bruno also received the crown of martyrdom (1008). Other efforts were made to convert the Prussians; but without much success till Christian, a Cistercian monk, made his appearance among them early in the thirteenth century. His labours being attended with unexpected success, he was consecrated bishop of Prussia, in 1215. The Pagan inhabitants of that country, having shortly afterwards engaged in a war of extermination against the Christians, the Teutonic Knights came to the assistance of the latter, in 1226, and soon succeeded in establishing their authority over that and the neighbouring countries.

Established their sovereignty over Prussia.

Their temporal sovereignty continued down to the sixteenth century, when Albert of Brandenburg, who was appointed their grand master to secure his assistance against the neighbouring Poles, passed over to Protestantism, and formed (1525) most of the possessions of the Teutonic Knights into a duchy, to be held by himself and his descendants. By the Peace of Venice (1809) the Order was deprived of its possessions, which were handed over to the rulers of the different countries in which they were situated. There still survive a few houses of the Order in Austria.

D.—THE MENDICANT ORDERS.

Their characteristics.

The aim of these Orders was to bring home to the minds of Christians, both by preaching and example, the truths of the Gospel, and thus supply an answer to those heretics who were taunting the Church with the wealth and negligence of her clergy. The members were obliged to lead lives of the strictest poverty, living entirely on the alms of the faithful—hence their name—and to move about among the people preaching the word of God and administering the sacraments to all who were prepared to receive them. Hence the Mendicants differed from other Orders—(*a*) in their not being allowed to hold property, either collectively or individually; and (*b*) in their making the sanctification of others the chief object of their institute.

Their rule of poverty modified by different Popes.

When the necessity for the strict poverty to which they were originally bound ceased with the disappearance of those heretics who made the wealth of the Church the occasion of separating from her, their rule of mendicancy was gradually modified by different Popes till the time of

the Council of Trent, which allowed [1] all religious to hold property, with the exception of the Franciscans of the Strict Observance and the Capuchins.

Numerous mendicant societies made their appearance during the first half of the thirteenth century; but they were all abolished by Gregory X. at the second General Council of Lyons (1274), with the exception of the four established with the express consent of the Holy See, viz., the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Augustinian Hermits. Number of Mendicant Orders.

§ 1. *The Dominicans.*

St. Dominic, to whom the Order owes its name as well as its origin, was descended from the noble house of Gusman, and was born in the year 1170, at Calaruega, a village in Old Castile. He studied in the University [2] of Palencia, where he distinguished himself by his proficiency in the sacred sciences and by his charity [3] towards the poor. Having been ordained priest, he was created canon in his native diocese of Osma, in 1199.[4] His strict ascetical life, and his success as a preacher, soon attracted the attention Early life of St. Dominic.

---

[1] "Concedit S. Synodus omnibus monasteriis et domibus tam virorum quam mulierum, etiam mendicantium (exceptis domibus Fratrum S. Francisci Capucinorum et eorum qui Minores de Observantia vocantur) etiam quibus, aut ex constitutionibus suis erat prohibitum, aut ex privilegio Apostolico non erat concessum, ut deinceps dona immobilia eis liceat possidere." Sess. xxv., cap. 3.

[2] Removed to Salamanca in 1239.

[3] We are told (Malvenda, *Annales Praedicatorum*, Ad an. 1184) that he sold his books during a famine that visited the country in 1191, and gave the proceeds to the poor, saying that he would not study from dead skins while his fellow-men were dying.

[4] See chronology of his life in the *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. xxxiv., 373.

of Diego, bishop of the diocese, by whom he was made sub-prior [1] of the cathedral chapter.

He preaches among the Albigenses (1205-16).

Diego being sent (1204) on an important mission [2] to Denmark [3] in the interest of his sovereign, Alphonsus IX., took St. Dominic with him. While passing through Languedoc they saw the harm that was being done in that country by the spread of the Albigensian heresy. Being touched with pity at the spiritual condition of the people, they resolved to devote themselves to labouring for their conversion. Their resolution was approved (1205) by Innocent III., who allowed Diego to remain absent from his diocese for two years. The Bishop of Osma being obliged to return to Spain, in 1207, authorized his sub-prior to continue the good work they had so successfully begun.

After the departure of Diego, St. Dominic continued to labour with wonderful success among the Albigenses. He led a life of strict poverty; was unceasing in preaching

---

[1] He was, therefore, chief among the canons; the bishop, as head of the chapter, being prior.

[2] The mission was to negotiate a marriage between his sovereign and the daughter of the Danish king. According to Jordanus, a contemporary of St. Dominic's (*History of the Origin of the Friars Preachers*, n. 13), Diego was sent, in 1203, to arrange the marriage, and again, in 1204, to bring the princess to Spain. But on arriving at the Danish court on the latter occasion, they found the princess dead, which is said to have confirmed them in their resolution to labour zealously for the conversion of sinners.

[3] There is considerable controversy regarding the country to which Diego was sent. The early biographers of St. Dominic call it Marchiae, by which Malvenda (*Annales Praedicatorum*, Ad an. 1205) understands Denmark. Others say the country was Dacia, as Bernard Guido speaks of Marchiae as synonymous with Dacia (in Marchias seu in Daciam, Martene, *Coll. Ampliss.*, vi. 397). But we must remember that during the Middle Ages Dacia was frequently used for Dania. While others, in fine, understand Le Marche in France.

the word of God, and performed numerous miracles in proof of his mission. In 1207 he established a society of nuns at Prouille for the education of the daughters of the poorer nobles, who often sent their children to the free schools of the heretics. They afterwards adopted the rule drawn up by St. Dominic for the Friars Preachers, and founded a convent at Rome, in 1218, which became the chief house of the Dominican nuns.

He founds a Convent at Prouille (1207).

What contributed most to the success of St. Dominic's preaching was the institution of the Holy Rosary, which is said to have been recommended to him by the Blessed Virgin.[1] This devotion, which consists of mental and vocal prayer, was admirably suited to the needs of the time. For in the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary we have a compendium of our Saviour's life, and an outline of those truths that were attacked by the Albigenses.

The Holy Rosary.

In the course of his labours among these sectaries he fully realized the great need there was of a body of missionaries who would devote themselves to preaching among the people by word and example. He resolved to meet this want by founding an Order which would combine the contemplative life of the monk with the active

He founds the Order of Friars Preachers (1215).

---

[1] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1213, n. 18; Malvenda. *Annales Praedicatorum*, Ad an. 1215, cap. 10; Benedict XIV., *De Beatif. Sanctorum*, iv., pars ii., cap. 10, nn. 21, 22.

For the arguments against the Dominican origin of the Rosary, see the *Acta Sanctorum*, August 4, vol. xxxiv., 423-37. The two chief arguments are—(*a*) that none of the three hundred witnesses examined in the process of St. Dominic's canonization referred to it; and (*b*) that Alanus, a writer of the fifteenth century, is the first who connects the devotion with the name of St. Dominic. And even he says that the Rosary had been practised from the time of the Apostles: but that St. Dominic received a special commission from the Blessed Virgin to preach it to the people.

career of the missionary priest. Having fully matured his plans, he set out for Rome, in 1215, to obtain the approval of the Holy See. Innocent III., who was Pope at the time, was at first unwilling to give his consent, as the foundation of the new Orders had been just forbidden by the fourth General Council of Lateran. He finally yielded to St. Dominic's petition; but required that some rule already approved should be adopted by the new Order. St. Dominic returned to Languedoc, and after consultation with his brethren selected the rule of St. Augustine, to which some new constitutions were added. He set out for Rome again, in 1216, to secure the solemn approval of his Order, which had been as yet only orally recognised. On his arrival there he found that Innocent III. had died, and had been succeeded by Honorius III. The latter, influenced, it is said, by a vision, in which he saw St. Dominic supporting the Lateran basilica on his shoulders,[1] issued two Bulls, in 1216, approving the new Order[2] under the title of Friars Preachers.

Popularity of the new Order,

After its approval, the Order spread with marvellous rapidity throughout Europe, and before the end of the century possessed many houses in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Its popularity was owing as well to the fame of its illustrious founder as to the high character acquired by his followers for their zealous and uncompromising defence of religious truth against the enemies of the faith, some by their preachings, others by their writings, and

---

[1] A similar vision is said to have been vouchsafed in 1210, to Innocent III. with regard to St. Francis.—*Acta Sanct.*, xlix. 591.

[2] Its first house was founded at Toulouse, in 1215; but in 1220 the monastery of St. Sabina, in Rome, became the head-quarters of the Order.

others, in fine, by their lectures in universities and public schools.

St. Dominic appointed Master of the Sacred Palace.

Honorius III., acting on the advice of St. Dominic, created the office of Master of the Sacred Palace, whose duty it was to attend to the spiritual interests of the Papal household. The censorship of books was attached to the office at a later date. It was conferred by the Pope on St. Dominic, and has been since filled by a member of his Order.

First General Chapter of the Order (1220).

A General Chapter of the Friars Preachers was held at Bologna, in 1220, by which the Order was declared mendicant,[1] and therefore incapable of possessing property. Here St. Dominic was visited in the course of the following year by St. Francis, who, remained, with him for some days; shortly afterwards St. Dominic passed to his reward[2] (August 4th, 1221).

Third Order of St. Dominic.

A third Order of St. Dominic, called Tertiary Dominicans, was founded in 1221,[3] consisting of persons who, while taking no religious vows, observed the Dominican rule as far as their state of life permitted. They lived, for the most part, in the world. Some, however, lived in community, as St. Catherine of Sienna, who is recognised as the patroness of the Order. It formed a link between the

---

[1] The right of the Dominicans to hold property underwent many changes, (1) By Honorius's bulls of approval they could hold property as an Order. (2) By the constitution drawn up at Bologna they deprived themselves of that right. (3) The right of holding property was restored to *some houses* of the Order by Gregory IX., Innocent IV., &c. (4) This right was extended (1396) to the *whole Order* by Boniface IX., in his bull *Religionis Zelus*. (5) Sixtus IV., in his bull, *Considerantes* (1475) granted to *all houses* of the Order the right of holding property in the fullest sense. *Cursus Theologiae Moralis Salmanticensis, De Justitia et Jure*, cap. ii., sec. 12.

[2] He was canonized by Gregory IX., in 1234.

[3] Malvenda, *Annales Praed.*, Ad an. 1221.

cloister and the world, and was found to be a most effective means of fostering religious practices among the laity.

§ II. *The Franciscans.*

Early life of St. Francis.

St. Francis, the founder of the Order, was born of wealthy parents at Assisi, in Umbria, in 1182. His baptismal name was John; but this was afterwards changed[1] into that by which he is now known, by his father, Bernardini, on his return from France, where he had been at the time of his son's birth. In his early life he followed the business of his father, who was a merchant, and led an idle and worldly life, without, however, being guilty of any grave irregularity. In a war which broke out (about 1202), between Assisi and Perugia, St. Francis was taken prisoner, and remained in the hands of his captors for a year. Shortly after his release, he was visited by a severe attack of illness. These reverses had the effect of turning his mind from a world of uncertainty to one of greater security. His spiritual reflections ended in his resolving (1206) to enter on a complete change of life.

Resolves to carry out the evangelical counsels (1206).

Henceforth St. Francis appeared to have but the one idea—of labouring for the salvation of his own soul and the souls of his neighbours. To render himself the more acceptable to God, he resolved to carry out, as far as possible, the evangelical counsels, especially that in which we are told to "give to every one that asketh." In his desire to act up to this counsel, he had recourse to the most extra-

[1] Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, Ad an. 1182; *Acta Sanct.*, xlix. 555-9. Some say that the change was made in allusion to the father's recent visit to France; others, that the change took place at a later date, and was owing to the love of the youthful Francis for French literature.

ordinary devices. We are told,[1] for instance, that on one occasion he exchanged his clothes with a beggar, having nothing else to give; and that, on another, he sold his father's horse, and gave the money to a priest, who was engaged in building a church.

Summoned before the Bishop

His action in giving away his father's money without permission involved him in difficulties. He was cited to appear before the civil magistrates, and afterwards before the bishop of the diocese. The latter ordered him to restore the money, and to resign all claims to his father's estates. Whereupon St. Francis, divesting himself of his clothes, except a rough hair shirt which he wore next his skin, declared: "Till now I have been the son of Bernardini; henceforth I have but one Father, Him that is in heaven."

Enters on a life of absolute poverty.

From this time he entered on a life of absolute poverty, which he called his bride, and went about the country observing strictly Christ's advice[2] to His Apostles, to go forth without money in their purses, or staff, or shoes, or change of garment. To poverty he joined extreme humility, being ever ready to perform the most menial services. Thus, he assisted in restoring the Church of St. Damian, and in building two others, one of which was that of St. Mary of the Angels, afterwards known as the Portiuncula or Little Inheritance, the great sanctuary of the Franciscans. And he took a special delight in tending the lepers[3] who happened to be very numerous in Italy at that time, washing their feet, dressing their sores, and showing, in various

[1] *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. xlix. 567.
[2] St. Matthew, x. 9, 10.
[3] *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. xlix., 366.

other ways, his loving sympathy with that ostracized class of humanity.

His Order approved.

The wonderful piety and enthusiasm of St. Francis soon attracted disciples anxious to follow his mode of life, and to place themselves under his spiritual direction. As soon as their number reached eleven, he drew up a rule[1] for their observance, and set out (1210)[2] for Rome along with some of his companions, to obtain the approval of the Holy See. Innocent III., who was then Pope, gave his verbal approval after some hesitation; and, having conferred tonsure on St. Francis[3] and his associates, authorized them to preach the Word of God. The institute was solemnly approved as an Order by Honorius III., in 1223.

His followers not allowed to hold any property.

The followers of St. Francis were obliged to live entirely on the alms of the faithful, and were strictly prohibited to possess any property, either individually or as a community. They were the first to practise monastic mendicancy, which was intended by the founder of the Order to be the great secret of their efficiency and success. And to render the poverty of his religious acceptable to God, St. Francis insisted strongly on the practice of humility. Their dress, which was that of the country peasants about Assisi, and the meagreness of their food, were intended to symbolize their poverty; while the name of Minorites which they

---

[1] His early biographers say it was very brief, consisting mostly of extracts from the Gospels. Wadding says (*Annales*, Ad an. 1210) that it consisted of twenty-three chapters; while as given by Holstein (*Cod. Reg.*, iii. 30, it consists of only twelve.

[2] Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, Ad an. 1210. The date given in the *Acta Sanctorum* (xlix. 574) is 1209.

[3] He shortly afterwards received the different orders up to deaconship, in which he remained till his death. (*Acta Sanct.*, xlix. 645.)

bore was intended to bring home to them the humility they were bound to practise.

St. Francis desirous to receive the crown of martyrdom, set out for Egypt, in 1219, along with twelve companions to preach the Gospel to the Mohammedans. He arrived there immediately after the capture[1] of Damietta by the Crusaders. The latter being shortly afterwards defeated, he boldly undertook to convert the victors to Christianity. Being taken prisoner, he was brought before the Sultan, to whom he explained his mission. He appealed to the Mohammedans to embrace the Gospel, and challenged them to an ordeal to prove the truth of Christianity. The Sultan, fearing the consequences of the saint's presence[2] among his soldiers, ordered him to be taken back to the Christian army.[3] Disappointed at not having converted the Mohammedans, or received the martyr's crown, he immediately left Egypt and returned[4] to Italy.

He goes to Egypt and appears before the Sultan (1219).

The year 1224 is memorable in the life of St. Francis, being that in which he received the Stigmata, or impressions of the Saviour's wounds. The scene of the occurrence was Mount Alvernia, in the Apennines, whither he had retired to observe a special fast in honour of the Archangel Michael. As he was engaged one day in earnest prayer, he saw a seraph having between two of his wings a figure of Christ crucified ; and he immediately received the

The Stigmata.

---

[1] According to Wadding, *Annales* Ad an. 1219, he went first to Syria.

[2] *Acta Sanct.*, xlix. 619.

[3] A full account of St. Francis' interview with the Sultan is given by the continuator of William of Tyre, in the *History of the Sacred War*. The continuation, which is written in French, is given by Martene, in his *Collectio Amplissima*, vol. v., pages 582-752.

[4] Wadding says (Ad an. 1219) he returned by Palestine.

impressions of the sacred wounds on his own body. The flesh grew out on his hands and feet in the form of nails, the heads appearing on one side and the points on the other, while his side seemed as if pierced by a lance, blood flowing occasionally from the wound. This miraculous phenomenon which was witnessed by many [1] of St. Francis' contemporaries is commemorated by an annual festival celebrated on the 17th September.

Second and Third Orders of St. Francis.

A female branch of the Order was founded in 1212, by a noble maiden of Assisi, named Clara Sciffi († 1253), who, influenced by the example and preaching of St. Francis, abandoned the world and entered upon a life of extreme asceticism. Her[2] institute rapidly increased in numbers; and St. Francis drew up a rule for the observance of her religious, in 1214. In the course of the same year a third branch of the Order was founded, similar to the Dominican Tertiaries.

Spread of the Franciscan Order.

The Franciscan Order spread with wonderful rapidity after its approval by the Holy See. Thus we find that so many attended at the first General Chapter held in 1219, that it was necessary to provide for their accommodation by erecting tents in the fields—hence known as the *Chapter of Mats*. And within a half century after its foundation the Order could count as many as 8,000

---

[1] *e.g.*, Elias, who refers to it in announcing his death to the members of the Order (Wadding, *Annales*, Ad an. 1226); Thomas of Celano, his confessor and biographer; St. Bonaventure, who says that the sacred impressions were seen by many cardinals and others of irreproachable character; and by Gregory IX. and Alexander IV., who vouch for the stigmata in many of their letters; *Acta Sanct.*, xlix. 653.

[2] Her followers were known as the nuns of St. Clare, or poor Clares.

houses and about 200,000 members in different parts of Christendom.

St. Francis, feeling that his end was at hand, had himself carried to the Church of Portiuncula, where, lying on the bare boards, he exhorted his brethren to practise charity, poverty, and humility. Having bestowed on them his blessing, he yielded up his stainless soul into the hands of his Creator, on the 4th of October, 1226; and was canonized two years later by Gregory IX.

Death of St. Francis (1226).

St. Francis, who had not himself gone through any lengthened course of studies, dreading the pride of learning among his religious, encouraged them to study the cross rather than books. Yet we find that within a few years after his death members of his Order held some of the highest literary positions in Europe. Thus two of them were appointed to chairs in the University of Paris in 1231, two years after the Dominicans had secured a like honour.

Literary attainments of the Franciscans.

The strict poverty to which the Franciscans were bound was intended by their founder to be the safeguard of their union and strength. It turned out, however, to be to them a source of division and weakness. Even during the lifetime of St. Francis many of his disciples, headed by Elias of Cortona, sought to put a mild construction on the vow of poverty, maintaining that they might enjoy the use of property, the ownership of which was vested in the Holy See. On the appointment of Elias to the office of Superior-General of the Order, in 1226, his teaching prevailed for a time. But he was deposed by Gregory IX., in 1230, at the request of the rigorists, St. Anthony of Padua being elected in his place. Shortly after the death of the latter (1231), Elias was re-elected; but was again deposed by

Divisions among the Franciscans.

Elias advocates a mitigation of the rule of poverty.

Gregory IX., in 1239, because of his harsh treatment of the rigorists. Having taken the side of Frederick II. in his quarrel with the Holy See, he was excommunicated; but was reconciled with the Church before his death, which occurred in 1253.

Temporary triumph of the rigorists.

When St. Bonaventure, who was personally in favour of the strict interpretation of the rule[1] of poverty, became General of the Order in 1256, he succeeded by his prudent and conciliatory government in moderating the opposition between the two sections of the Franciscans known as the *Conventuals* and the *Spirituals*, or rigorists. At the same time he secured the temporary triumph of the Spirituals by obtaining from Alexander IV., in 1260, the revocation of a previous constitution issued (1254) by Innocent IV. in favour of the Conventuals.

The Bull *Exiit qui seminat* (1279).

After the death of St. Bonaventure, in 1274, the opposition between the Conventuals and Spirituals became more marked than ever. It soon became so serious that Nicholas III. (1277-80) felt bound to interfere in the interests of peace and union. He issued the Bull *Exiit qui seminat*, in 1279, declaring the property of the Franciscans to be vested in the Holy See, while the administration of it belonged to the Order. Similar constitutions were issued by subsequent Popes. But the Spirituals refused to avail themselves of the privilege granted to them; and called themselves Fratricelli, to indicate their humility and poverty. Many of them took up an attitude of open defiance to the

---

[1] The principal dispute turned on the interpretation of the following constitution:—"Fratres nihil approprient; nec donum nec locum nec aliquam rem, sed tanquam peregrini et advenae in hoc saeculo in paupertate, et humilitate Deo famulantes, vadant pro eleemosyna confidenter."

Holy See, and maintained that the Pope could not interfere with the rule of St. Francis, for which some of them claimed an authority equal to that of the Gospels. The chief exponents of their views were Gerhard, in his *Introduction to the Eternal Gospel*,[1] written in 1254, in which he taught that as Judaism had been superseded by Christianity, so was Christianity to be superseded by a more perfect dispensation introduced by St. Francis; and Peter[2] of Oliva († 1297), who advanced similar views in his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*.[3]

Not accepted by the Fratricelli.

Celestine V., being anxious to reconcile the extreme Spirituals with the Church, granted (1294) them permission to form an independent community under the name of Poor Hermits. The permission, was, however, revoked by Celestine's successor, Boniface VIII. (1294-1303), who ordered them to rejoin the Franciscan Order. Many of them refusing to obey the Papal injunction, were excommunicated by Clement V. (1303-14), and formed a schismatical sect, under the name of Fratricellian Spiritualists.

Schismatical Sect of the Fratricellian Spiritualists.

A fresh source of division among the Franciscans was supplied in 1321 by their general, Michael of Caesena, who maintained that Christ and His Apostles had no property either collectively or individually; and, therefore, no ownership in the necessaries of life, but only their use. This gave rise to a controversy which turned mainly on

Dispute about things destructible by first use.

---

[1] *The Eternal Gospel* was a work generally ascribed to Joachim († 1202), who was abbot successively of the Cistercian Monasteries of Corace and Floris, in Calabria. In this work it was maintained that the law of Christ was to give way to the Law of the Holy Spirit.

[2] He retracted his erroneous opinions in 1282, and died at peace with the Church.

[3] This work was condemned by John XXII. (1316-34).

the question of how far the right to use such things as food, &c., can be separated from their ownership. Many of the Franciscans, following the lead of their general, held that as their property was invested in the Holy See, according to the declaration of Nicholas III., they had not the ownership even of the necessaries of life, but merely the right to use them. Others, however, claimed an ownership in those things in which the ownership is inseparable from the right to use.

First Constitution of John XII. (1322

The controversy became so heated that John XXII. deemed it necessary to appoint a commission to report on the opinions of both sides. But before the commission could complete its work, a general chapter of the Franciscans, held at Perugia, addressed a circular letter to the Catholic world endorsing the teaching of their general. John XXII. issued a constitution, in 1322, in which he shows that Nicholas III., in declaring the Franciscan property vested in the Holy See, did not include such things as the necessaries of life; and concludes by resigning all ownership of Franciscan property, as the name of the Pope had been too freely used by the members of the Order in collecting their revenues. A second Papal constitution was issued in the following year, declaring the teaching of Michael of Caesena erroneous and heretical. The Franciscan general, joined by William of Ockham and other members of his Order, refused to accept John's decision, and took the side of Louis of Bavaria, Emperor of Germany, in his quarrel with the Papacy. These schismatical religious soon put forward many heretical doctrines, which were adopted by the Wicliffites and other sectaries of a later date.

Second Constitution (1323).

Notwithstanding the close resemblance between the

Dominicans and Franciscans, which induced St. Dominic on one occasion to propose their amalgamation to St. Francis, a spirit of rivalry and jealously manifested itself between the two Orders from the very beginning. Various efforts were made on both sides to moderate this feeling and keep it within due bounds. We find, for instance, that the two generals addressed a joint letter to their religious, in 1256, exhorting them to follow the example of brotherly charity given by the founders of their orders. The rivalry, however continued, and manifested itself chiefly in their schools of theology and philosophy; for the Thomists, representing the Dominicans, and the Scotists, the Franciscans, took opposite sides in the controversies of the thirteenth and succeeding centuries.[1]

Rivalry between the Dominicans and Franciscans.

§ 3. *The Carmelites.*

The Carmelites trace their origin back to the time of the Prophet Elias, who flourished during the tenth century before Christ. It is said that he withdrew with a number of companions to Mount Carmel,[2] where they entered on a life of prayer and strict asceticism; and that his religious institute continued down to the Christian era, when the Carmelite hermits embraced Christianity, and rapidly spread throughout the East. Various causes, we are told, contributed during the sixth and seventh centuries to bring about the decay of the Order, which continued till the thirteenth century, when it received a new rule from

Said to have been founded by Elias.

---

[1] They were opposed on the questions of the Immaculate Conception, Indifferent Acts, the nature of Realism, the Matter and Form of the Sacrament of Penance, &c.

[2] This mountain is situated on a promontory to the west of Palestine.

Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and immediately entered on a fresh period of activity and usefulness.

This opinion denied by Papebroch and others.

This view of the antiquity of the Carmelites was rejected by Papebroch in the seventeenth century. The learned Bollandist, whose opinion is now pretty generally adopted, maintained[1] that the Order was founded on Mount Carmel by Berthold, a priest of Calabria, who settled down there along with some companions about the year 1156. They were attracted thither by the association of the place with Elias, and formed a religious society, with Berthold as their superior. At the request of Brocard, the successor of Berthold, a rule[2] was drawn up for their observance, in 1209, by Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem. It was approved by Honorius III., in 1224, and was very strict, enjoining absolute poverty, and prohibiting the use of flesh meat.

Controversy regarding the antiquity of the Order.

The publication of Papebroch's views gave rise to an animated controversy between the Carmelites and those who denied the antiquity of their Order. It soon became so heated that Innocent XII. interfered (1698) in the interests of charity, enjoining silence on both sides, under the penalty of excommunication. The subsequent permission given by Benedict XIII. (1724-30) to have a statue of Elias placed in St. Peter's, beside those of the great founders of Christian monachism, was appealed to by the Carmelites as an additional argument in support of their opinion.

Being compelled by the Mohammedans to abandon their home an Mount Carmel, early in the thirteenth century, the Carmelites withdrew to Europe, where they spread

---

[1] *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. ix., 775, and Introduction to vol. x.

[2] The rule is given in sixteen brief chapters in the *Acta Sanct.*, ix. 775.

with wonderful rapidity. They were declared a mendicant Order, in 1245, by Innocent IV., who modified their rule to suit their changed condition. It was further modified, in 1431, by Eugene IV., which led to the division of the Carmelites into the *Barefooted*, who adhered to the original rule; and the *Shod* or *Conventuals*, who accepted the constitution of Eugene IV. Spread of the Carmelites in Europe.

As the founders of the Dominicans instituted one form of devotion in honour of the Blessed Virgin, so is a famous general of the Carmelites, St. Simon Stock, said to have originated another, viz., that of the Scapular. He was a native of Kent, in England, where he was born in 1165. After spending twenty years as a religious recluse,[1] he joined the Carmelites in 1240. Being promoted to the important office of General, five years later, he ruled the Order with great success till 1265, when he died at Bordeaux. We are told that the Blessed Virgin appeared to him on one occasion (1251) as he was engaged in earnest prayer, and holding a scapular in her hands, said: "My beloved son, receive this scapular of your Order, the sign of my confraternity, a privilege to you and all the Carmelites. Whoever dies clothed with it shall not suffer the pains of hell."[2] The Carmelite Scapular.

The promise made to St. Simon Stock is said to have been amplified at a later date (1322), when the Blessed

---

[1] He lived in the hollow trunk of a tree (= stock); hence his name *Acta Sanct.*, May 16th, xiv. 654.

[2] The authenticity of this promise has been rejected by not a few Catholic writers since the time of Launoy, who wrote (1653) his well-known work, *De Viso Simonis Stochii*, against it. The general opinion, however, of Catholic writers is expressed by the learned Benedict XIV., who thus writes (*De Festis*, i., § ii., cap. 6):—"For our part, we believe the truth of the vision, and we think that everyone should believe it."

The Sabbatine Bull.

Virgin appeared to John XXII. and promised a release from purgatory on the Saturday after death to all who wore the scapular and complied with certain conditions.[1] This new privilege is said to have been published by John in a Bull known as the *Sabbatine Bull*.[2]

§ 4. *The Augustinian Friars.*[3]

Their Origin.

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were scattered over Italy and other countries large numbers of religious solitaries who belonged to no Order, and followed no definite rule of monastic life. They were brought together, in 1256, by Alexander IV., who drew up a rule for their observance based on that of St. Augustine, and approved them as the fourth of the Mendicant Orders, under the name of Hermits of St. Augustine. They soon possessed houses in nearly every part of Europe; and numbered about thirty thousand at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

§ 5. *Opposition of the Secular Clergy to the Mendicants.*

Causes of the Opposition.

The privileges accorded to the Mendicants, of hearing the confessions of all who approached them, and giving them Holy Communion, as well as their success as preachers

---

[1] The special conditions are—(*a*) to observe the chastity proper to one's state of life; and (*b*) to recite the little office of the Blessed Virgin, the canonical office being sufficient in the case of priests and others bound to say it. Those who cannot say the office can gain the privilege by abstaining from flesh meat on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays.

[2] The authenticity of the Bull has been also denied by Launoy and many other Catholic writers.

[3] The Mendicants were styled Friars or Brothers, the Dominicans being known from the colour of the dress in which they appeared in public as Black Friars; the Franciscans, as Gray Friars; and the Carmelites, as White Friars.

and professors, aroused against them a strong spirit of opposition among the secular clergy. This opposition first manifested itself in the University of Paris, where a fear was entertained that if no check were put on them they would soon occupy all the professorial chairs to the exclusion of seculars.

William of St. Amour.

Their most formidable enemy was a doctor of the Sorbonne, named William of St. Amour († 1270), who used his great powers of eloquence in ridiculing them and their professions of poverty. His first violent attack on them was contained in his *Sermon on the Pharisee and Publican,* in which the Mendicants were painted as the modern Pharisees. He afterwards wrote a work entitled *The Perils of the Last Times*, for which he was severely censured by Alexander IV. (1256), and expelled from the university. Shortly after the death of Alexander (1261), he returned to Paris, and published a new edition of the work. While renewing most of the charges put forth in the first edition, he denied that he attacked the Orders, but merely their personnel. And to show that he was animated with no ill feeling towards the former, he asked when dying to be buried in a Dominican cemetery. His attacks drew forth replies in defence of the Mendicants from such men as St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and Albert the Great.

Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh.

In the course of the next century a resolute opponent of the Mendicants occupied the Primatial See of Ireland in the person of Fitzralph. He had been Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and was appointed to Armagh in 1347. Shortly after his appointment he quarrelled with some of the Friars of his diocese. Having occasion shortly afterwards to go to England, he preached a sermon

in St. Paul's, in which he advanced nine *conclusions*[1] against the Mendicant Orders, maintaining among other theses that Christ never begged nor counselled begging, and that voluntary mendicity was against every law, human and divine. Being accused to Innocent VI. (1352-62) of teaching heterodox doctrine, he was cited to appear at Avignon. A commission was appointed to inquire into his opinions. But he died, in 1361, before the commission had completed its labours. His *conclusions*, were, however, condemned after his death.

[1] See Brenan, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, 336; Wadding, *Annales*, iv. 62.

CHAPTER X.

SCHOLASTICISM.

Its origin and revival.

By scholasticism[1] is generally understood the speculative theology of the Middle Ages. It may be said to have commenced with this epoch; and continued to engage the greatest minds of Christendom for about five centuries. During the fifteenth century it was obliged to yield the field it had so long occupied to the ancient literature of Greece and Rome; and was allowed to remain in obscurity for over three hundred years, being condemned by those who did not understand it. The present century, however, has witnessed its revival in the schools of theology and philosophy. Nor is the general esteem in which it is held confined to Catholics. It is shared by such leaders of Protestant thought as Hegel, Alexander Von Humboldt, Coleridge, and Sir William Hamilton.

Its characteristics.

The following are the chief characteristics of scholasticism:—

(*a*) It treats theology as a science with its own first principles, which are to be received on the authority of faith,

[1] The name is derived from the title by which the heads of the schools (*scholastici*) in which it was first taught were known. In the days of the old Roman empire the term *scholastic* was used to denote a teacher of rhetoric or philosophy; and was also sometimes applied to the pupils. During the ninth and following centuries, the heads of cathedral schools and similar institutions were known as *scholastics*.

and from which the other truths of the Christian religion are shown to follow as a logical necessity. It, therefore, differs from positive theology, which is a simple statement or exposition of the traditional teaching of the Church. "It was the *how* and the *why*," says Dr. Trench,[1] "never the *what* of the Church's teaching which the schoolmen undertook to discuss. *Doctores* they claimed to be, not *Patres;* not as fathers *productive;* not professing to bring out of their treasures things new, but only to justify and establish things old."

(*b*) It uses freely arguments from reason to support revelation, by showing that many of the truths of faith can be proved independently by reason, and that the other truths which cannot be so proved are not opposed to its teaching. In this respect, as well as in the preceding, it agrees with the system of teaching theology pursued by the catechetical school of Alexandria.

(*c*) It differs, however, from the Alexandrian system, by the free use it made of the syllogistic mode of argument to which every truth and objection were forced to submit for the purpose of showing the more clearly the strength of the one and the weakness of the other.

(*d*) It treats of the whole range of revealed truth, as well as of numerous other subjects that have a bearing on revelation. Hence, it differs, at least in comprehensiveness, from dogmatic theology, to which it is most closely allied. The latter, as its name implies, deals primarily only with that part of revelation which is defined by the Church. It also frequently discusses other questions; but only to show where dogma ends and opinion begins.

---

[1] *Lect. on Med. Ch. History*, 206.

The causes to which it owed its origin.

If we wish to inquire into the causes that contributed to produce scholasticism, we shall find them—(*a*) in the strong and dominating influence of faith during the Middle Ages; (*b*) in the stimulus given to education throughout his vast dominions by Charlemagne; (*c*) in the rise of universities;[1] (*d*) in the influence of Aristotle's[2] writings, described by Blunt[3] as "the life-blood of scholasticism;" (*e*) in the intellectual activity of the Germans, youthful Christian nations, conscious of their mental powers, and anxious to use them; and (*f*) in the absence of almost every other

[1] Universities were of spontaneous growth, being gradually developed out of the cathedral and monastic schools founded during the ninth and tenth centuries. Towards the end of the eleventh and early in the twelfth century many distinguished teachers made their appearance, who attracted to their schools large crowds of students. Such were Lanfranc and St. Anselm at Bec, William of Champeaux and Abelard at Paris, Anselm at Laon, and Irnerius at Bologna. Of the schools that owed their pre-eminence to the teachers just mentioned the most famous were those of Paris and Bologna. The arts were cultivated in the former, while law was studied in the latter. By degrees, however, other subjects of learning were added in both schools, till they were at length designated, towards the middle of the twelfth century, by the name of *Studia Generalia*. The students attending these and other schools soon became so numerous, that they received various privileges, ecclesiastical and civil, from popes and kings; amongst others, that they should form corporations (*universitates*), exempt from ordinary civil jurisdiction—hence the name. In the Paris University, and all others founded after its model, the teachers constituted the Corporation; while in that of Bologna and other Italian universities the corporate rights were vested in the hands of the students, who could, therefore, enact bye-laws and appoint their professors. *Colleges and halls* were afterwards added for the support of poor students, as well as to supply a place of residence for those who wished to live under the superintendence of the university officials. When universities were fully organized, early in the thirteenth century, the custom of granting degrees was introduced, masters being entitled to teach in arts, and doctors in other subjects; while bachelors were allowed to teach only under the direction of a master or doctor. See Newman, *Discourses on University Education*.

[2] As Plato had been the great philosopher of the Alexandrians, so was Aristotle of the schoolmen.

[3] *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, Art. "Theology."

literary field in which they could engage, theology being then deemed the highest and only study worthy of great minds. Hence they applied themselves with all their energies to constructing a theological system, which for profound thought, intellectual daring, subtle reasoning, and accuracy of expression, has no rival among the creations of the human mind.

History of medieva scholasticism divided into three periods.

The history of medieval scholasticism is generally divided into three periods: the first, extending approximately over the twelfth century; the second, over the thirteenth century; and the third, over the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

A.—*The First Period.*

The most prominent scholastics of this period were, St. Anselm, Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard, Hugh of St. Victor, and Richard of St. Victor. Among these St. Anselm deservedly holds the chief place, because it was he who first laid down the principles on which scholasticism was based, and applied them in practice.

St. Anselm

This remarkable man, the Augustine of the Middle Ages, as he has been fittingly styled, was born at Aosta, in Piedmont in the year 1033. Having studied for some time in his native country, and afterwards at different schools in France, he was attracted to the Abbey of Bec in 1060, by the fame of its prior, Lanfranc. Here he embraced the religious state; and on the removal of Lanfranc, in 1063, to the newly-founded monastery of St. Stephen at Caen, he was appointed to the vacant office of prior. On the death of Herluin, the founder and abbot of Bec, in 1078, St. Anselm was elected his successor; and, in 1093, was appointed to succeed his former master,

Lanfranc, in the See of Canterbury, which he governed till his death, in 1109.

St. Anselm was remarkable as a churchman and as a scholar. For the present we shall confine our attention to him in the latter capacity. As head of the monastic school of Bec, he lectured with great *éclat* on theology and philosophy, and soon won for himself a world-wide fame. In different works, written by him during his stay here, and at a later date, he defines the relations[1] between faith and reason. While faith, he says, precedes science, and informs the mind of the truths of revelation, it is the duty of reason to systematize these truths, and to prove them, when possible, by independent arguments. Faith does not, therefore, according to him, ignore the functions of reason; nor does reason transgress its legitimate limits by interfering with the province of faith.

He lays down the principles of scholasticism.

In his first great work, the *Monologium*, so called because he is represented as reasoning with himself *alone*, he sets forth the usual metaphysical proofs of the existence of God, and explains the divine attributes. This work was written at Bec, as well as his *Proslogium*[2] *seu Fides quaerens intellectum*, which also treats of God. In the latter he lays down his famous ontological argument to prove the existence of God. "God," he says,[3] "is a being greater

His *Monologium* and *Proslogium*.

---

[1] Thus he writes in his *Monologium*: "Neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam; sed credo ut intelligam; nam et hoc credo quod nisi credidero non intelligam." Cap. i. Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, clviii. And in his *Cur Deus Homo* he says: "Sicut rectus ordo exigit ut profunda Christianae fidei credamus priusquam ea praesumamus ratione discutere, ita negligentiae mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere." Cap. ii., Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, clix.

[2] So called because he addresses himself to God.

[3] Cap. iii.

than whom cannot be conceived: he who comprehends this will perceive that the Divine Being so exists that his non-existence is inconceivable." The argument was further developed in a rejoinder which he wrote against a monk named Gaunilo, by whom it was attacked.

His *Cur Deus Homo.*

In carrying out his great aim of proving the beautiful harmony that exists between faith and reason, he wrote his remarkable book, *Cur Deus Homo*, which has affected subsequent speculation on the Incarnation more than any other work of man. In it he shows that atonement for sin required the intervention of a Man-God; and that redemption was a necessary consequence of the Incarnation.

His controversy with Roscellin about the Trinity.

The erroneous teaching of Roscellin, a canon of Compiegne, regarding the Trinity, called forth another well-known work from the pen of St. Anselm. The former, who was a Nominalist, taught that universal

---

[1] There are terms in every language called *universals*, which designate an entire class or species without particularizing any individual of that class. It has been a subject of dispute from the earliest times how far such terms represent an idea in the human mind, and have a corresponding reality in the outer world. Some maintain that they are a mere sound of the voice, having nothing corresponding to them in the mind or in the outer world—these are called *Nominalists*; others, that they are represented by an idea of the mind, but by nothing in the outer world—these are styled *Conceptualists*, though classed by some writers under the head of Nominalists; and others, in fine, that they are represented both by an idea and an external reality—these are known as *Realists*. The last mentioned are sub-divided into two classes—viz., the extreme Realists, who hold that the universal exists *formally* in the outer world; and the moderate Realists, called by some philosophers Conceptualists, who say that objects of the same class merely supply the foundation for the universal concept in the mind.

The controversy may be said to date from the time of the philosophers of ancient Greece. Plato was an extreme Realist, maintaining that the universal was formally represented in the outer world—viz., in the prototypal idea; Aristotle was a modified Realist; while the Stoics, thinking that they were bound to oppose both, propounded the theory of Conceptualism.

were mere words; and, that, therefore, there was nothing real in the outer world except the individual. Applying this doctrine to the Trinity, he maintained that the substance of the Godhead was incommunicable; and that therefore, each of the Divine Persons should have his own substance. His contention, as described by St. Anselm,[1] was that "if the three Divine Persons be not three things (*res*), considered individually as three angels or three souls; but one and the same thing, so that they are the same in will and power, it follows that the Father and the Holy Ghost became incarnate with the Son." His errors were condemned by the Synod of Soissons, in 1092, upon which he retracted them.

St. Anselm, who had commenced to write a defence of the Christian dogma of the Trinity, on hearing of

His work *De Fide Trinitatis*

Porphyry, the most distinguished of the Neo-Platonists, applied himself to the study of the vexed question; but ended by declaring his inability to arrive at any conclusion (*Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle*). Two centuries later Boethius, the famous Roman statesman and philosopher, while freely admitting the difficulty of forming a definite opinion on the merits of the controversy, appears to have finally embraced the Conceptualist idea. For he says (Opp. 56:) "Cogitantur vero universalia, nihilque aliud species esse putanda est nisi *cogitatio collecta ex individuorum dissimilium numero substantiali similitudine; genus vero cogitatio, collecta ex specierum similitudine.*" And in the ninth century Scotus Erigena embraced the doctrine of extreme Realism, which led him into Pantheism.

After this time we hear no more of the controversy till its revival by Roscellin, towards the end of the eleventh century. His advocacy of Nominalism, and the use made of it to combat the doctrine of the Trinity, discredited his theory for centuries (John of Salisbury, *Met.*, ii. 17). And the advocacy of his pupil, Peter Abelard, had the same effect on Conceptualism. After his time the controversy was mostly confined to the two sections of the Realists down to the fourteenth century, when Nominalism and Conceptualism were again revived.

[1] *De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. i.; Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, clviii. 262. None of Roscellin's writings have come down to us.

Roscellin's retractation, abandoned his undertaking. But learning shortly afterwards that he had relapsed into his former errors, St. Anselm completed his work, *De Fide Trinitatis*,[1] in which he defends the doctrine of modified realism; and shows that, while there is but one substance in the Trinity, there is a sufficient distinction between the Persons to enable us to say that the Son took human nature, without implying that the Father and the Holy Ghost also became incarnate.

Roscellin's later history.

Owing to the storm of opposition raised against Roscellin in France by his tritheistic teaching, he withdrew to England, where he remained till 1097, when he returned to his native country, and was reconciled with the Church by Ivo, Bishop of Chartres. He was appointed to a canonry in the Church of St. Martin, at Tours, which position he retained down to the time of his death (about 1121).

Cause of his erroneous teaching.

The origin of Roscellin's errors is to be sought in his overlooking the sound principles laid down by Anselm regarding the relations between faith and reason, the latter being allowed by him to transgress its proper limits, and set itself up in judgment on the teaching of faith. This fault was carried to still greater excess by his famous pupil, Peter Abelard, justly styled the precursor of modern Rationalists.

Peter Abelard.

Abelard was born of pious and respectable parents at Palais, near Nantes, in 1079. Having acquired, at an early age, a passionate taste for literature, especially for

[1] Among his numerous other works, the following may be mentioned:—*On the Procession of the Holy Ghost*, *On the Will of God*, *The Fall of Satan*, *On Original Sin*, *On Grace and Free Will*, *The Use of Unleavened Bread*, and *Marriage between Relatives*.

philosophy, he resigned his right to a share in his father's possessions to devote himself wholly to a life of study. His first master appears to have been Roscellin, whose teaching on Nominalism he attacked and refuted. He afterwards studied under William of Champeaux, head of the Cathedral School at Paris. It was not long, however till a quarrel between himself and his master obliged him to take his departure from the city.

He lectures at Melun and St. Victor's.

In 1102 he went to Melun, where he began to lecture with great success on logic. He shortly afterwards removed to Corbeil, so as to be near Paris. He was, however, obliged to interrupt his work of teaching by a severe attack of sickness; and returned to his native Brittany, where he spent some time in recruiting his exhausted strength. When he found himself sufficiently strong to resume his literary pursuits, he went to the Abbey of St. Victor, near Paris, where his old master, William of Champeaux was lecturing at the time on rhetoric and philosophy. He had, however, scarcely resumed his studies when he again incurred the displeasure of William by combating his[1] teaching on universals, and obliging him to modify[2] his theory of extreme Realism. This led to his withdrawal from St. Victor's. He directed his steps to Paris and afterwards to Melun, where he re-opened his lectures on philosophy. After a short stay here he returned to Paris, and commenced

His quarrel with William of Champeaux.

---

[1] William maintained that the *universal* was "res eadem essentialiter tota simul." To this Abelard objected by saying; "If humanity be the entire substance at once of Plato and Socrates, when Plato is at Rome and Socrates at Athens, the entire substance of both is in two places at once." Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctr. and Hist. of Theology*, Art. "Conceptualism."

[2] Abelard says of him: "Sic autem istam suam sententiam correxit, ut deinceps rem eandem non essentialiter, sed indifferenter diceret." *Historia Calamitatum*, 2.

to lecture on the Mount of St. Genevieve without the city. As soon as William heard of his arrival he resumed his lectures in Paris, hoping to compel his rival to withdraw from the neighbourhood of the capital; but in this he was completely disappointed, for he soon found himself deserted, while crowds of students gathered to hear Abelard. After lecturing here for some time he went to Brittany, to take leave of his mother, who was about to follow her husband's example by embracing the religious state

Lectures on the Mount of St. Genevieve

He attends the Lectures of Anselm of Laon.

On his return to Paris, in 1112, he found that William of Champeaux had been appointed to the Bishopric of Chalons-sur-Marne. Being thus left without a rival in philosophy, he resolved to explore a new field of knowledge, viz., that of theology, in search of controversy, from which he appeared to derive so much pleasure. For this purpose he repaired to Laon, to attend the lectures of a distinguished theologian named Anselm, the most renowned of those who had studied under his namesake at Bec. He was not long here when he fancied that he was better qualified to teach theology than his master; and undertook to deliver a course of lectures on Ezekiel, the most difficult and obscure of the prophets. His lectures soon became very popular, and were attended by large crowds of students. This aroused the jealousy of Anselm, who used the authority with which he was vested to prohibit Abelard, who was not legally qualified, to lecture publicly on theology at Laon.

His departure from Laon.

Abelard returned to Paris in 1118, and taught theology with great *éclat*. Shortly after his arrival here he became acquainted with a lady who exercised a wonderful influence over his future life. This was Eloisa, the beautiful and

accomplished niece of a Paris canon, named Fulbert, who was then in her nineteenth year. She became one of his pupils; and in a very short time, an inordinate affection sprang up between them, which resulted in the birth of a son, who was called Astrolabius. Fulbert, who discovered, only when it was too late, the mistake he had made in allowing such intimate relations between his niece and Abelard, sought to repair as far as possible the evil that had been done, by proposing that they should get married. To this Abelard[1] consented, though much against the wish of Eloisa.[2] Their marriage was celebrated privately in Paris. But it was scarcely over when Fulbert, though he had promised to keep the matter secret, proclaimed it publicly.

He becomes acquainted with Eloisa (1118).

Eloisa having denied her marriage, was subjected to various forms of indignity by Fulbert. When the news of her treatment reached the ears of Abelard, he had her removed, in 1119, to the Convent of Argenteuil, so that she might be out of the reach of her uncle. Here she shortly afterwards took the veil. Abelard's action being considered by Fulbert as a repudiation of his marriage, the latter hired some venal servants to enter his room by night and disgracefully mutilate him. He withdrew immediately

Eloisa becomes a nun.

[1] Abelard's position in the Church at the time is a subject of much dispute. It appears certain that he was not in Holy Orders, as they had become a *diriment impediment* to matrimony before his time. We have it on his own authority that he was a cleric and a canon (Ep. i.); but it is unknown where he held the canonry. It is also disputed whether he afterwards became a priest. It appears most probable that he did, for he is addressed as "priest" and "monk" by Eloisa in one of her letters (Ep. iv.), written to him after he had embraced the religious state. Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, clxxviii. 191.

[2] She was opposed to his marriage, as she feared it would interfere with his literary pursuits, and cause him to lose the prebend which he held; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, ii. 322.

after this occurrence to the Abbey of St. Denys, where he took the religious habit.

Abelard's *Introduction to Theology.*

Abelard was not allowed to remain long quiet in his new home. He was induced by petitions from various quarters to re-open his lectures on theology and philosophy which were attended by large crowds of students. At their request he wrote his *Introduction to Theology*, in which he is said to have taught Arianism.[1] This error was the result of his applying to the doctrine of the Trinity his theory of pure conceptualism. Like Roscellin he maintained that there was nothing real outside the mind except the individual. Hence he taught that each of the Persons of the Trinity must have a distinct substance—the Son, according to him, being inferior to the Father, and the Holy Ghost to both. Being denounced to the Archbishop of Rheims for teaching heresy, he was cited to appear before the Council of Soissons in 1121. Here his book was condemned, and himself sentenced to imprisonment in the Monastery of St. Medard. He was shortly afterwards released at the request of the Papal legate, and allowed to return to the Abbey of St. Denys.

His condemnation by Council of Soissons (1121).

His departure from the Abbey of St. Denys.

He was scarcely back in his monastic home when he became involved in fresh troubles by denying the identity of Denys, the first Bishop of Paris, with Denys the Areopagite. This aroused against him such a storm of opposition at St. Denys, that he fled from the monastery to a place near Nogent on the Seine, where he built for himself and a single attendant who accompanied him a cell of

[1] Some speak of Abelard as a Sabellian, who taught that the Father alone was God, and that He manifested Himself to the world in two superior creatures, viz., Christ and the Holy Ghost. Alzog (Eng. ed.), ii. 538; Rob., v. 113.

reeds and straw. It was not long till his new retreat was invaded by crowds of students drawn thither by the fame of his learning. The humble cell soon gave way to a magnificent structure; and the students raised close by a chapel, called the Paraclete,[1] as it was dedicated to the Holy Ghost.

Accepts the abbacy of St Gildas (1126).

He left the Paraclete,[2] in 1126, to accept the abbacy of St. Gildas, at Ruys, in Brittany, which appeared to promise him a life of peaceful retirement. Here he laboured energetically to restore monastic discipline which had fallen into decay. But finding that his efforts were fruitless, he resigned the office, in 1135, and went to Paris, where he spent a year in lecturing on theology and philosophy. Among his pupils was John of Salisbury, who afterwards became Bishop of Chartres (1179-82).

His *Sic et Non*

It was about this time that he wrote his remarkable book, *Sic et Non*, the aim of which was to arouse a spirit of doubt[3] in the minds of Christians. For doubt, he used to say, leads to inquiry, and inquiry to faith; in which he differed widely from the orthodox scholastics of his age, who taught that faith should precede science and direct it. In this work, the opinions of the fathers are set forth under one hundred and fifth-eight heads, the *Yes* of one being opposed by the *No* of another. Nor does he seek to harmonize their apparently conflicting statements, for that would defeat his purpose; but leaves them to be understood and explained by the reader.

---

[1] Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, ii. 322.

[2] It was afterwards given by Abelard to Eloisa and her community, who were obliged to leave Argenteuil, in 1129, because of the charge of laxness of discipline brought against them.

[3] Not without reason, therefore, do the Rationalists claim Abelard for their school.

His errors condemned by Council of Sens (1140).

Shortly after the appearance of the *Sic et Non* Abelard was charged by St. Bernard with teaching various errors—with being an Arian, when speaking of the Trinity; with being an Pelagian, when writing on grace; and with being a Nestorian, when treating of the Incarnation.[1] He was summoned to appear before the Council of Sens, in 1140, to answer the charge of heterodoxy against him. St. Bernard consented, after some hesitation, to appear as his opponent. But when the errors attributed to Abelard were publicly read, he refused, to the surprise of all present, to defend himself before a tribunal which he said was prejudiced against him, and forthwith appealed to Rome. After his departure from Sens, his errors[2] were condemned by the fathers, who abstained from passing any sentence against himself because of his appeal. They wrote to Innocent II., asking him to confirm their decrees, and to pronounce sentence against Abelard. With this request the Pope complied by condemning Abelard and his errors, but only in general terms.

He enters the Abbey of Clugny.

Abelard was on his way to Rome to prosecute his appeal, when he heard at Lyons that he had been condemned by the Pope as a heretic. He immediately retraced his steps, and

---

[1] See St. Bernard's letter to Cardinal Guido (Ep. 192), as well as many other letters written by him about 1140 (*e.g.*, Epp. 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 340, &c.).

[2] Fourteen out of seventeen propositions extracted from his writings were condemned "as false and heretical." Of these the following are the most noteworthy:—(*a*) The Son and the Holy Ghost are inferior in power to the Father; (*b*) the Holy Ghost did not proceed from the substance of the Father or the Son; (*c*) God's absolute power is co-extensive with that which He has exercised or will exercise; (*d*) it is only the punishment of Adam's sin that is transmitted to his descendants; and (*e*) man can initiate and perform salutary works without the assistance of grace.

sought refuge in the Abbey of Clugny, where he was kindly received by Peter the Venerable. The latter used his influence to secure his absolution from the censures he had incurred, and to bring about a reconciliation between him and St. Bernard. Having become a monk in Clugny, Abelard entered on a life of prayer and extreme austerities. His health having soon begun to give way, he was removed to the dependent monastery of St. Marcel, near Chalons, where he died a holy death, in 1142, having previously declared his adhesion to the orthodox faith. At his request his body was conveyed for interment[1] to the Paraclete, that Eloisa might see what she had loved in loving man.

His Death.

The *Sic et Non* of Abelard gave a new direction to scholasticism during the latter half of the twelfth century. It was necessary that the false principles laid down in that book should be combated, and that the apparently contradictory statements of the fathers should be reconciled. It was this necessity that gave rise to the *Books of the Sentences*. The chief Sententiaries were Hugh of St. Victor († 1141), Robert Pulleyne († 1153), Richard of St. Victor (†1173), and Peter Lombard († 1164). Among these the last mentioned holds the first place.

Effect of the *Sic et Non* on Scholasticism.

The Sententiaries.

Peter Lombard, commonly known as the Master of the Sentences, was born of humble parents at Novara in Lombardy. Having studied for some time at Bologna, he was brought under the notice of St. Bernard, who was so favourably impressed by his piety and talents, that he sent him to Rheims to complete his education. He was

Peter Lombard.

---

[1] The remains of Abelard and Eloisa were transferred early in the present century to the cemetery of Pere-la-Chaise, in Paris.

appointed professor of theology in Paris, in 1141. His fame as a lecturer soon attracted large numbers of students. For their use he wrote his famous work, *The Four Books of the Sentences*, in which he treats of the entire range of revealed religion. In the first book he treats of God; in the second, of creatures and their relation to God; in the third, of the Incarnation, virtues, and vices; and in the fourth, of the sacraments and the future states. In discussing each question, he first lays down the doctrine to be defended; then adduces various arguments in support of it from Scripture, tradition, and reason; afterwards answers the objections urged from different sources against his thesis; and, finally, examines the opinions of modern writers on the subject under consideration. This work, which was modestly compared by its author to the widow's mite, thrown into the treasury of the temple, was commented on by the most distinguished scholastics for centuries after his death.

The *Four Books of the Sentences.*

Peter Lombard was appointed Archbishop of Paris in 1159, which office he continued to grace by his learning and many virtues till his death, in 1164. We are told that shortly after his elevation to the episcopate, his mother paid him a visit, dressed in a costly garb, such as was thought becoming in the mother of the Archbishop of Paris. But she was much disappointed at not being admitted to an interview with him, till she put on the dress suitable to her own station in life.

Peter Lombard appointed Archbishop of Paris.

B.—*The Second Period.*

This, the golden age of scholasticism, was distinguished from the preceding by the freer use of syllogistic argument, and a fuller knowledge of the writings of the fathers and

Its distinctive features.

of Aristotle. The only portion of Aristotle's works known in Latin Christendom before the middle of the eleventh century was the *Organon*, or treatise on logic, translated by Boethius. Towards the end, however, of that century, more of the great philosopher's writings became known among the Christians of the West, through commentaries and translations made by Arabian philosophers,[1] who adulterated his teaching by the importation of their own heterodox opinions. The errors into which so many students of Aristotle fell during the twelfth and latter part of the eleventh century, such as Roscellin, Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée,[2] Amalric of Bena,[3] and David of Dinanto, naturally excited general prejudice against his writings in the minds of orthodox ecclesiastics. Hence we find that a council held at Paris, in 1209, at which the pantheistic teaching of David of Dinanto was

Study of Aristotle's works in Latin Christendom.

---

[1] Their writings were introduced into Latin Christendom through the Mohammedans of Spain and Sicily. The translation which exercised the greatest influence in the West, was that made by a Spanish Mohammedan named Averrhoes († 1198).

Gilbert, after distinguishing himself as a lecturer, became Bishop of Poitiers, in 1141. He was a Nominalist; and like Roscellin and Abelard, applied his nominalist theory to the doctrine of the Trinity, with the result that he fell into error by teaching that the Son, but not the Divine Essence, became incarnate, and that there was a real distinction between God and His attributes. Some of his writings were condemned at the Synod of Rheims, in 1148, at which Eugene III. was present; but he escaped condemnation himself by promising not to use nominalism for the future, in treating of the doctrine of the Trinity. For different opinions regarding the nature of his errors, see Billuart, *Theologia juxta S. Mentem Thomae* (Paris, 1878), i. 52, 53; and Perrone, *Prael. Theol.*, i. 281.

Amalrac of Bena († 1209), a theologian of Paris, taught Pantheism, for which he was condemned by the University of Paris, in 1204, and four years later by Innocent III. He had some followers, the most prominent being a Paris goldsmith, named David of Dinanto, whose pantheistic teaching was condemned by a council held at Paris, in 1209.

anathematized, condemned the natural philosophy and metaphysics of Aristotle as then translated. The condemnation was renewed six years later by the Papal legate, Robert Curzon. And Gregory IX. issued a Brief in 1231, forbidding the reading of any of Aristotle's works, except the *Organon*, "till they should be examined and corrected."[1] But when the accurate Greek versions of Aristotle's works, imported into the West by the Crusaders, were translated early in the thirteenth century, the former prejudice against his writings rapidly disappeared. They were commented on by some of the greatest of the scholastics, and impressed their character deep on the theology of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Nearly all the great scholastics of the period were members of the two Mendicant Orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis, the most illustrious names being those of Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Roger Bacon, St. Thomas of Aquin, St. Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus.

Alexander of Hales.

Alexander was born at a place called Hales, in Gloucestershire, hence his surname. After studying for some time at Oxford, he went to Paris to complete his theological education. Having joined the Franciscans, in 1222, he was appointed to a Chair in the University, in 1231, being the first of his Order to obtain the honour; and continued to teach here down to his death, in 1245. He wrote commentaries on the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle and the *Sentences*[2] of Peter Lombard. At the request of

His *Sum of Theology.*

[1] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1231; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers* (Eng. ed.), ii. 480.

[2] His *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard* and his *Sum of Theology* are treated by some writers (*v.g.*, Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, ii. 432) as one work, entitled, *A Sum and Commentary on the Master of the Sentences.*

Innocent IV. he wrote his *Sum of Universal Theology*,[1] in which he departed from the methods of teaching theology pursued by the Sententiaries. His profound learning has secured for him the title of Irrefragable Doctor.

Albert the Great.

At the time that Alexander of Hales joined the Franciscans, a more remarkable man was preparing to join the Dominicans in the person of Albert the Great. He was born of noble parents at Lauingen, in Swabia, in 1193. It is said that he was exceptionally stupid in his earlier years, but that he afterwards received brilliant talents through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, to whom he was specially devoted. Having studied successively at Paris, Padua, and Bologna, he became a Dominican in 1223; and lectured on theology and philosophy in Paris, Cologne, and other great centres of education. He was appointed to the office of Provincial of the Order in Germany, in 1254; and six years later became Bishop of Ratisbon. He resigned his see, however, in 1263, and resumed his professorial duties at Cologne, where he remained till his death, in 1280. He has been styled the Universal Doctor, because of the extent and variety of his knowledge. "There is no writer," says Dupin,[2] "who has more works printed under his name, for they fill twenty-one folio volumes."

His voluminous writings.

Roger Bacon.

Contemporary with Albert the Great was the famous Englishman, Roger Bacon. He was born at Ilchester, in 1214; and after studying at Oxford and Paris, joined the Franciscans, in 1248. We are told that the range of his knowledge embraced almost every subject then known—Latin, Greek, Hebrew, poetry, rhetoric, history, philosophy,

[1] Alexander of Hales was, therefore, the first of the *Summists*.

[2] *Eccl. Writers*, ii. 432.

mathematics, medicine, chemistry, and theology. Hence he was known among his contemporaries as the Wonderful Doctor.

His *Opus Majus.*

His chief work was the *Opus Majus*,[1] written in 1267, and dedicated to his friend, Clement IV. It is a treatise on theology, philosophy, and the whole range of the physical sciences, as then understood. In it he advocates a reform of the scholastic methods of argument by recommending a more sparing use of the syllogism, and a freer use of induction,[2] in which he anticipated his namesake, Lord Bacon, and other modern philosophers.

His imprisonment.

Bacon's views on many subjects, especially on the natural sciences, aroused the suspicions of his superiors regarding his orthodoxy. His writings were condemned by the Superior General of the Franciscans,[3] in 1277, because of "some suspicious novelties"[4] which they contained; and the author sentenced to imprisonment. It is uncertain how long his confinement lasted. We only know that he was released some time before his death, which occurred about 1292.

St. Bonaventure.

Another great scholastic of this period was St. Bonaventure,[5] who was born at Bagnarea, not far from

[1] It was written at the request of Clement IV., who wished to have a work embracing the results of Bacon's labours. He wrote two other works shortly afterwards, viz., his *Opus Minus* and his *Opus Tertium*, to supplement the *Opus Majus*.

[2] It is generally admitted that he knew of gunpowder, if he was not the actual discoverer of it. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctr. and Hist. Theology*, 749.

[3] Jerome of Ascoli, who afterwards became Pope, under the name of Nicholas IV. (1288-92).

[4] Antoninus, *Chronicon* (ed. Venet., 1586), iii. 779.

[5] His original name was John of Fidanza. But it was changed into that by which he is known in history, because, being delicate when young, he was brought by his mother to St. Francis, who prophesied his future greatness (bona ventura). He never afterwards suffered from any illness till the time of his death. *Acta Sanct.*, xxix. 811.

Viterbo, in 1221. Having studied theology under Alexander of Hales, he entered the Order of which his master was such a bright ornament, in 1248. He taught theology for some time in Paris, and was appointed General of the Franciscans in 1256. He refused the Archbishopric of York, in 1266; but at the request of Gregory X. he consented, in 1273, to accept the position of Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. In the course of the following year he died at Lyons, having gone thither to attend the second General Council held in that city.

His best-known works are his *Commentarii in Libros P. Lombardi;* his *Reductio Artium Liberalium ad Theologiam*, in which he shows the relation between theology and the other sciences; and his *Centiloquium*, and his *Breviloquium*, containing a complete exposition of dogmatic theology. The deep practical piety that characterizes all his writings has secured for him the title of the Seraphic Doctor. His writings.

The greatest of the schoolmen was the illustrious Dominican, St. Thomas of Aquin. He was born in 1227, in the castle of Rocca Sicca, overlooking the town of Aquino, from which he takes his name. He was closely related to the house of Hohenstaufen, his grandmother being sister of Frederick Barbarossa; and was connected with many of the other royal families of Europe. Having received his elementary education in the monastery of Monte Cassino, he was sent, at the age of eleven, to Naples where he studied moral philosophy under Peter Martin, and natural philosophy under Peter the Hibernian. *St. Thomas of Aquin.*

Having completed his philosophical education, he joined the Dominicans, in 1242. When his mother heard what he had done, she hastened to Naples; but on her arrival

was disappointed at finding that he had been sent to the monastery of St. Sabina in Rome. Thither she followed him; but before she reached her destination he had been sent to Paris. She forthwith appealed to his two brothers, who were at the time serving in the Imperial army, to bring him back. Acceding to her request, they succeeded in capturing Thomas, and brought him back to Rocca Sicca. Here he was placed under strict surveillance; and various efforts[1] were used, but in vain, to induce him to abandon his intention of becoming a mendicant.

He joins the Dominicans.

He studies at Cologne under Albert the Great.

After a confinement of eighteen months, St. Thomas succeeded in making his escape, and fled to Naples, where he immediately made his religious profession. He was sent to Cologne to study theology under Albert the Great. During his stay here he was remarkable for his taciturn disposition, on account of which he was known as the "Dumb Sicilian Ox." At the same time he gave ample evidence of brilliant intellectual parts, as appears from the eulogy passed on him by his master at the close of a disputation in which he had taken part. "We call him," exclaimed Albert, "the Dumb Sicilian Ox; but the time will come when the whole world will listen to his voice."

He teaches at Paris, Bologna, and Naples.

He went to Paris, in 1245, to complete his studies. After remaining here for three years, he returned to Cologne, where he assisted Albert in teaching theology and philosophy. He afterwards lectured with great applause in Paris, Bologna, and Naples. Various ecclesiastical preferments were offered to him, among others the

[1] Even the arts of a woman of evil fame were used to undermine his virtue; but he drove her out of his room with a red-hot iron. Upon which, we are told, his loins were girt by angels with a white cord, as a sign of purity and a pledge of its inviolability.

archbishopric of Naples; but he steadfastly refused to accept them, prefering to die a simple mendicant friar. At the request of Gregory X., he set out for Lyons, early in 1274, to attend the Ecumenical Council to be held there that year. But taking sick on the way, he breathed his last in the Cistercian Monastery of Fossa Nuova, at the early age of forty-seven.

His writings.

St. Thomas is known as the Angelic Doctor, as well because of the stainless purity of his soul as because of his wonderful mastery of the sacred sciences. His writings are very numerous. He wrote commentaries on the works of Aristotle, the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and different parts of the Sacred Scriptures. His greatest work, however, is his *Sum of Theology*, which he commenced in 1265, and at which he continued to work down to within a few months of his death. It consists of three parts, the first of which treats of God and creatures in general; the second which is subdivided into the *Prima Secundae* and the *Secunda Secundae*, of man and his moral relations to his Creator; and the third, of the Incarnation, the Sacraments, and the last things. St. Thomas wrote the ninetieth question of the third part towards the end of 1273, the remaining portion being completed, after his death, from his public lectures.

His teaching always held in high repute.

For strictness of method, depth of thought, and extent of knowledge, the *Sum* has no equal among the works of the scholastics. It has done more for the science of theology than any other book ever written; and has been always held in high repute in the Church for the orthodoxy of its teaching. So much, for instance, was it esteemed by the fathers of Trent, that it was placed on the secretary's desk beside the Gospels. And at no time, perhaps,

did it occupy a more honoured place in Catholic schools than at present, owing in no small degree to the lively interest manifested in it by Leo XIII.[1]

John Duns Scotus.

For many years the Angelic Doctor reigned supreme in the schools, no one venturing to dispute his title, But there soon appeared among the Franciscans an illustrious teacher in the person of John Duns Scotus, who was set up by his followers as a successful rival of the great Dominican. He was born, according to some, in 1274, and according to others in 1266. As his name indicates, he was an Irishman,[2] by nationality, though there have not being wanting some[3] who claimed him for England, and others who say that he was a Scotchman. Little or nothing is known of his early life, and very little about his general history, the chief points that appear certain being that he taught with great *éclat* in the universities of Oxford, Paris, and Cologne; that he was a prolific writer; and that he died at Cologne, about 1308.

His character and writings.

His subtlety in reasoning, as well as his strict adherence to the dialectical form of argument, have won for him the title of the Subtle Doctor. His opponents styled him Quodlibetarian, from the custom followed by him of stating the arguments for and against a proposition without drawing any conclusion. Dean Milman speaks of him as "without doubt the acutest and most penetrating spirit of the Middle

---

[1] See his *Encyclical on the Restoration of Christian Philosophy in Catholic Schools, according to the teaching of St. Thomas*, 1879.

[2] The inscription on his tomb in Cologne runs thus:—

"Scotia me genuit, Anglia me suscepit,
Gallia me docuit, Colonia me tenuit."

[3] English writers who claim him for their country, say that he was born at Dunstan, now Dunse, in Northumberland while Scotch writers point to Dunse, eight miles north of the Tweed, as his birth-place.

Ages." His works are very numerous. He wrote commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard,[1] on different portions of the Sacred Scriptures, and on the Metaphysics of Aristotle, besides many treatises of minor importance. From his time we must date the rivalry between the two great schools of the Thomists and Scotists, that appeared to feel bound to take opposite sides on every free question that turned up for discussion.

Third Period.

Causes of the decay of scholasticism.

Scholasticism was on the wane during this period, owing to various causes, the chief of which we shall briefly describe.

First. The schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had explored the entire field of Christian theology, having classified and systematized the products of preceding ages. Their successors being, therefore, left without any new field of labour, occupied themselves mostly in controversies about trivial questions which were chiefly carried on by quibbles and hair-splitting distinctions. This appeared to many to be a waste of time, and brought discredit on the system that gave rise to it. "The new sophists," says[2] a writer of the fifteenth century, "have made a shameless traffic of the word of God, and transformed a most worthy science into a confused mesh of words. They discuss questions the most trifling, deal blows in the air, distort the meaning of Sacred Scripture, and draw on our holy faith the laughter and ridicule of the world."

---

[1] His commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard is known as the *Commentum Oxoniense*.

[2] Cornelius Agrippa, *De Vanitate Scientiarum*, i., cap. 97.

Secondly. The divorce that occurred between scholasticism and mysticism, about the beginning of the fourteenth century, made the former appear to many to be a dry formalism which was by no means calculated to stimulate piety and foster devotion.

Thirdly. The impetus given to the Greek and Roman classics during the latter half of the fifteenth century opened a new field of literary activity, and diverted the minds of scholars from a subject that appeared discredited to one which had at least the freshness of novelty to recommend it.

Chief scholastics of this period.

The most noteworthy scholastics of this period were Durandus[1] († 1333), a Dominican and prominent defender of nominalism; William of Ockham († 1347), who taught for a time in Paris, and afterwards became Provincial of the English Franciscans; Thomas Bradwardine († 1349), for a time professor in Oxford and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; Peter D'Ailly († 1425); Gerson († 1429); Nicholas of Clemanges († 1440); Nicholas of Cusa († 1464); and Gabriel Biel († 1495), the last of the great medieval schoolmen. To most of these we shall have occasion hereafter to refer more in detail.

[1] He and William of Ockham, who was also a Nominalist, renewed the controversy between the Nominalists and Realists, which continued during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Many of his opinions, especially on the Sacraments, were totally at variance with the generally received teaching of his age.

CHAPTER XI.

MYSTICISM.

THE great counterpart of Scholasticism is mysticism. The one is the theology of the intellect; the other, of the heart: the one is speculative; the other, practical: the one aims at illuminating the mind, by telling what God is in Himself and in His relations to His creatures; while the object of the other is to teach man how he is to become united with God. Mysticism may, therefore, be described to be that department of theology which treats of the innate tendency in the human soul to become united with its Creator. Its nature.

This tendency of the soul to a close union with God has been admitted, in one form or another, by all religions, ancient and modern. The union, however, is differently explained by those whose belief is based on pantheism, and those who reject the theory of emanation advocated by Neo-Platonism and most of the Eastern creeds. According to the former, the soul seeks to become united in substance with the Divinity; while the latter maintain that the union with God, after which it aspires, is one of love here and of glory hereafter. Recognised by all religions.

The mystical element has been recognised in the Christian Church from the very beginning. We find it referred to in various passages of the New Testament. Thus, the highest aim of the Christian mystic is expressed by St. Paul, Christian Mysticism.

when he says:[1] "I live, now not I ; but Christ liveth in me." And the means by which the soul becomes united with God are fully described by many of the early Christian writers, especially by St. Augustine in his *Confessions ;* and pseudo-Denys the Areopagite in his *Mystical Theology.*[2] According to the last-mentioned work, the Divine Essence is the source from which all beings receive, in regular gradations, their existence and perfections ; while the work of the pious Christian consists in the gradual elevation of his soul by successive communion with each higher order of beings, till perfect union with God Himself is attained. And it is only, we are told, by the disengagement of the affections from the inordinate love of ourselves and from all sensible things that we can arrive at the contemplation of the incomprehensible God.

Pseudo-Denys the Areopagite.

Scholastic Mysticism.

The scholastic Mystics, as they are called, of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, swayed by the scientific spirit of their age, collected and systematized the principles of mysticism laid down by previous writers on the subject. They distinguished three stages in the spiritual life ; viz., that of *Purification*, in which the soul is cleansed from sin and the power of the senses conquered; that of *Illumination*, in which the soul, having overcome the opposition of the flesh, gives itself up to spiritual contemplation; and that

[1] Gal., ch. ii., v. 20.

[2] This work was originally attributed to Denys the Areopagite, who was converted by St. Paul on the occasion of his visit to Athens (Acts of the Apostles, ch. xvii., v. 34). Nearly all modern writers, however, maintain that it, as well as the other works ascribed to the Areopagite, viz., *On the Heavenly Hierarchy*, *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and *On the Divine Names*, were not written till the fifth century.

of *Perfection*, in which the soul is completely forgetful of self, and thinks only of God. Perfect union with God, they said, manifested itself in ecstacies, prophecies, and other supernatural signs. During this age, scholasticism and mysticism went hand in hand, the most renowned scholastics being also the warmest Mystics, such as St. Anselm, Hugh and Robert of St. Victor, St. Thomas, and St. Bonaventure. This union was found to be most useful in restraining both sciences from being carried to extremes. Thus, while mysticism was prevented by scholasticism from ending in pantheism, the latter was in turn preserved from developing into a dry formalism, such as it became at a later date.

Advantages of union between Scholasticism and Mysticism.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries scholasticism and mysticism became divorced, to the great detriment of each. The divorce was first effected in Germany, owing—(*a*) to the dryness and useless quibbling into which scholasticism had begun to drift; (*b*) the lengthened quarrel between Louis of Bavaria and the Papacy, during which the Germans were often deprived of the public offices of the Church; and (*c*) to the neglect of the pastors to instruct their people. Many Christians, being thereby deprived of the ordinary channels of information about the truths of their religion, turned for spiritual enlightenment and consolation to a more immediate fellowship and intercommunion with God by prayer and meditation.

Divorce between Scholasticism and Mysticism.

The German Mystics come most prominently before us during these two centuries—hence generally known as the age of the German Mystics. They may be divided into two classes, viz., the orthodox and heterodox. Of the latter there were two sections, viz., those who, as the

The German Mystics.

Beghards[1] and Brethren of the Free Spirit,[2] applied their mystical principles to justify immorality and other offences against the law of God; and those pantheistical Mystics whose teaching was not attended by such revolting consequences in practice.

Eckhart.

The best representative of the speculative Pantheists among the German Mystics, is Henry Eckhart, usually styled Master Eckhart. The date of his birth, as of his death, is unknown. He was a Dominican, and became Provincial of his Order in Saxony, about the year 1304. He was an ardent student of pseudo-Denys the Areopagite, as well as of the Neo-Platonists, whose pantheistic views he imbibed. He taught, for instance, that the soul is transformed into God by prayer and meditation, just as the eucharistic bread is changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. Twenty-four propositions, taken from his writings, were condemned, after his death, by John XXII., in 1329; but not under his name, as he had submitted his teaching to the judgment of the Church. He is set down by some as one of the four great modern exponents of pantheism, the other three being Scotus Erigena, Spinoza, and Hegel.

---

[1] This sect made its appearance early in the fourteenth century. It consisted of men and women, who wore a grey habit, and professed to lead a religious life, without being shut up in monasteries or subject to superiors. They maintained that they had arrived at such a state of perfection, that their souls were completely united with God, and were, therefore, incapable of losing Him, no matter what they did.

[2] Closely allied to the Beghards were the Brethren of the Free Spirit, whose religious system was also based on pantheism. They maintained that they were free from all law and external observances, appealing to the words of St. Paul (Rom. viii. 2); "For the law of the spirit of life, in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death." According to some they were the followers of Almaric of Bena, while others hold that they were the same as the Beghards, though they differed in name.

The most famous of the orthodox German Mystics were John Tauler, Henry Suso, John Ruysbroek, and Thomas à Kempis.

Tauler was born at Strasburg, in 1290. After joining the Dominicans, he applied himself resolutely to the study of the great works on mystical theology, especially those of pseudo-Denys and Eckhart. He was, for a time, inclined to embrace the mystical teaching of the latter. But an incident occurred in 1340 which determined the character of his future mysticism. The incident is thus graphically[1] described by Milman: "In Strasburg appeared a stranger, who five times sat at the feet of Tauler, and listened to his preaching with serious, searching earnestness. He was a layman; he sought an interview with Tauler, confessed to him, and received the Eucharist from his hands. He then expressed a wish that Tauler would preach how man could attain perfection, that perfection to which he might aspire on earth. Tauler preached his loftiest mysticism. The stern man now spoke with authority, the authority of a more determined will, and more firm conviction: 'Thou art yet in slavery to the letter; thou knowest not the life-giving Spirit; thou art but a Pharisee; thou trustest in thine own power, in thine own learning; thou thinkest that thou seekest God's honour, and seekest thine own.' Tauler shuddered. 'Never man before reproved me for my sins.' He felt the spell of a master. 'Twelve years,' said the layman, reproving Tauler's self-righteousness, 'I have been toiling to the height of spiritual perfection which I have now attained by the

Tauler.

His change of life.

[1] *Lat Christianity*, vi. 557.

study of German works, by self-mortification and chastisements, which have now ceased to be necessary.' He gave Tauler certain simple moral rules, counselled him to preach no more, to hear no more confessions, to deny himself, and to meditate on the life and death of Christ till he had attained humility and regeneration. The stronger, the more positive and peremptory mind subdued the gentler. Tauler, for above two years, despite the wonder of his friends, and the taunts of his enemies, was silent. The first time, at the end of that period, when he attempted, under permission (for the inflexible layman watched him unceasingly), he broke down in a flood of tears." The stranger under whose influence he fell is said to have been Nicholas of Basle, who is represented by many writers as a Waldensian.

His teaching.

Tauler was an indefatigable preacher, and insisted strongly on the estrangement of the heart from creatures, the mortification of the will, and the practice of poverty. His teaching on the last-mentioned point is fully set forth in his work on the *Imitation of Christ's Life of Poverty*. On account of the knowledge which he showed of the spiritual life he was styled the Enlightened Doctor. He died at Strasburg, the chief scene of his labours, in 1361.

Henry Suso.

Contemporary with Tauler was another Dominican Mystic named Henry Suso,[1] who was born at Uberlingen, on the shores of Lake Constance, in the year 1300. Having joined the Dominicans at the age of twelve, he entered on a life of extreme mortification, which continued

[1] His original name was Henry von Berg, but it was changed into Henry Suso because of his sweet (*süss*), gentle disposition. Some say it was the Latinized form of his mother's name (Seuss).

down to his death, in 1365. He was unceasing in preaching; and wrote the *Book of Eternal Wisdom*, in which he represents Christ as conversing with His pious followers, and recounting the sufferings He had endured during His Passion.

John Ruysbroek.

Another prominent Mystic of this age was John Ruysbroek, the Ecstatic Doctor. He was born in the year 1293, and was educated for the priesthood. After his ordination he acted as a secular priest in Brussels till 1360, when he became a religious in the monastery of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, at Grontal, near Brussels, of which he was soon afterwards appointed prior; and entered on a life of great asceticism, which he continued till his death, in 1381. He is described as a man reputed for piety, but of little learning. He is the author of numerous works on the spiritual life, in the writing of which he claimed the immediate assistance of the Holy Ghost. In describing the condition of the soul in the state of perfection, he used some expressions that were interpreted by Gerson and others as implying the loss of man's personality in his complete union with God. He was defended, however, by a canon of his monastery against the charge of pantheism.

Thomas à Kempis.

The chief Mystic of the German school, and one of the most remarkable of all time, was Thomas Hemerken, usually called Thomas à Kempis, from the village of Kempen, near Cologne, where he was born in 1380. He was educated at Deventer, and at the age of twenty-one joined the Canons Regular of Mount St. Agnes, in the diocese of Utrecht, where he remained till his death, in 1471.

Thomas à Kempis devoted himself from his earliest years to a life of contemplation and asceticism; and was

an ardent student of the Sacred Scriptures and the writings of the Mystics. He is the author of numerous works on the spiritual life. But the one that has most interest for us is his *Imitation of Christ*, not only because of its intrinsic value, but also because of the controversy that has been carried on regarding its authorship. "It embraces," says[1] Dean Milman, "all that was elevating, passionate, and profoundly pious in the older Mystics. Its manner; its short, quivering sentences, which went at once to the heart, and laid hold to and clung tenaciously to the memory, with the compression and completeness of proverbs; its axioms, each of which suggested endless thought; its imagery, scriptural and simple, were alike original and unique." *The Imitation of Christ* is popular with all classes of Christians. With the exception of the Bible, no book has gone through so many editions.

The Imitation of Christ.

Its authorship.

The authorship of this remarkable book has given rise to much controversy. The works written on the subject would, of themselves, form a respectable library. Up to the seventeenth century the controversy appears to have turned chiefly on the rival claims of Thomas à Kempis and his famous contemporary Gerson, Chancellor of the Paris University, as the name of one or the other was written on almost all the old copies then known. But in the year 1604, a MS. was discovered at Arona which attributed the authorship of the book to an abbot named Gersen, for it commences with these words: "Incipiunt Capitula libri primi Abbatis Johannis Gersen." This, as well as some chronological difficulties, urged against either Thomas à Kempis or Gerson being considered the author,

[1] *Lat. Christianity*, vi. 482-83.

gave rise to a third opinion, defended by the Benedictine Cajetani, and many later writers, that the book was written by Gersen, Abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of Vercelli (1220-40). The controversy, which had been hitherto mostly confined to two claimants for the honour of authorship, now extended to three.[1] It soon waxed so warm that the French Parliament sought to terminate it by issuing a decree, in 1652, that the book should be printed for the future under the name of Thomas à Kempis. Parliamentary interference, however, does not appear to have had much effect on the controversy. Many works were written on the vexed question towards the end of the last century and during the first half of the present, with the result that critics are now mostly in favour of ascribing *The Imitation* to Thomas à Kempis.[2]

Other Mystics.

There were many other mystical writers during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries besides those of Germany, the best known being St. Catherine of Sienna and Gerson, the latter of whom endeavoured to reconcile the rival claims of scholasticism and mysticism. The most notable Mystics of more recent times were the two illustrious Carmelites, St. John of the Cross (†1581), and St. Teresa (†1582), and St. Francis de Sales (†1622).

---

[1] The authorship was also ascribed to St. Bernard and St. Francis of Assisi.

[2] The chief arguments in favour of ascribing the authorship of *The Imitation of Christ* to Thomas à Kempis, are the following:—(*a*) It supplies sufficient evidence to show that it was written by a monk. Such was Thomas à Kempis. (*b*) The style of the work bears a close resemblance to that of his other works, while it differs widely from that of any known author during the Middle Ages. (*c*) It is expressly attributed to him by three contemporaries, viz., John Busch, one of his own colleagues in his work, *Chronicon Windesemense* (Lib. ii., c. 21), written in 1464; Peter Scot, the editor of an edition of *The Imitation*, published in 1488; and J. Trittenheim, in his *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* (c. 707), written in 1494.

CHAPTER XII.

HERETICAL SECTS OF THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES.

Their general character.

THE chief heretical sects of these centuries were the Cathari, the Waldenses, and the Petrobrusians. They were all characterized by their opposition to the clergy because of their wealth and negligence.

A.— *The Cathari.*

The origin of the Cathar

About the beginning of the eleventh century some sectaries made their appearance in Western Europe, who professed Manichaean, Gnostic, and other kindred errors. The character of their teaching, as well as many incidents in their general history, would appear to point to their Asiatic origin, and to establish an historical connection between them and those sects that existed during the early ages of Christianity.

Manichaeans, Gnostics, and Paulicians.

The Manichaeans and Gnostics being severely persecuted by the Pagan as well as the Christian emperors of Rome, during the third and fourth centuries, took refuge in a remote district lying to the east of the Euphrates. In the course of the sixth or seventh century—the precise time is uncertain—they became merged in a new sect, known as the Paulicians, so called either from the name of their founder, or because they professed to follow the teaching of St. Paul. The Paulicians were treated with great

severity by the Eastern emperors during the eighth century, especially by Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymous, who had them transported in large numbers from the East to Bulgaria and Thrace.

Some of the Paulicians passed into Western Europe during the eleventh centruy. But it was not till the following century, when a freer intercourse was established between the East and the West by the Crusades, that they became widely spread in Italy, France, and Germany. They were variously designated[1] in different countries, the name by which they were commonly known being that of Cathari, because they boasted of great purity of life, compared to Christians generally. At Milan they were called Patarini; in other parts of Italy, Publicani; and in France they were known as Albigenses, from the town of Albi, or the district of Albigeois, in Languedoc, where they were specially numerous.

Cathari known by different names.

Their religious system was substantially the same as that of the early Manichaeans and Gnostics, presented in a new garb. The following were its chief tenets, as described by two contemporaries—Alanus, a monk of Citeaux, and Peter, a monk of Vaux-de-Cernay, who wrote against them:—(*a*) While many of them taught the Manichaean doctrine of Dualism, others held, with the Gnostics, the existence of one First Principle. (*b*) The Logos took a human body, but only in appearance. (*c*) The souls of men are fallen spirits imprisoned in bodies for punishment, and have to pass from state to state, till they are finally purified among the Cathari.

Their teaching.

[1] The various names by which they were known are given in the Acts of the third General Council of Lateran, in which they were condemned. See Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vi., pars. ii., 1677.

(*d*) They refused to receive the Sacraments of the Church, but had sacred rights of their own, the chief being the Consolamentum, by which sinners were restored to God's favour by the imposition of hands. Those who had received this rite were declared impeccable. And (*e*) they rejected marriage, and denied man's responsibility for his actions, which they held to be pre-ordained and independent of his will. Their moral teaching was, therefore, opposed to the dictates of reason, and subversive of social order, as well as of civil government.

Cathari divided into two classes.

The Cathari were divided into two classes, viz., the Perfect, who had received the Consolamentum, wore a special dress, and professed to lead lives of great austerity; and the Believers, who lived free from all restraint in the indulgence of their passions, and, at the same time, confident of salvation because of the prayers of the Perfect and the Consolamentum, which they expected to receive before death. If any Believer showed signs of convalescence after receiving this sacred rite, he was slowly bled to death by a process called the Endura. This was done to prevent their teaching about the impeccability of those who had received the Consolamentum being publicly falsified. They had a hierarchy which bore a close resemblance to the Christian hierarchy, and observed most of the Church's festivals, while changing their significance to suit their own system.

Their rapid spread.

The Cathari spread rapidly throughout Europe during the twelfth century. This was chiefly owing to the favour extended to them by the rulers of different countries, some of whom used them in carrying on wars, and others in opposing the Church's rights and privileges. Chief among their patrons were Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse, whom

many looked on, because of his unchristian conduct, as an apostate from the faith; and his vassal, Roger Viscount of Beziers, who was the immediate superior of the Albigeois district.[1]

Their errors condemned.

The Cathari and their errors were condemned by various councils held during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as those of Rheims (1148), Tours (1163), Verona (1184), and the third and fourth General Councils of Lateran (1179 and 1215). Alexander III. deemed it necessary to have a crusade preached against them in 1164, to repress their growing hostility to the Church. When Innocent III. became Pope, he sought at first to bring about their conversion by mild measures. He sent (1198) two Cistercian monks, named Rainer and Guido, who were held in high repute for their sanctity, to preach among the sectaries of Languedoc. They were joined, in 1205, by Diego, Bishop of Osma, and St. Dominic. And shortly afterwards two legates arrived, who, acting on the advice of St. Dominic, dismissed all appearances of their office and authority, and travelled barefooted from one end of the country to the other, preaching the word of God. Their preaching was not attended with the success generally expected, owing chiefly to the want of co-operation from the local clergy, who showed themselves for the most part unworthy of their sacred calling. The condition of Languedoc at this time was pitiable. "The churches," says[2] an anonymous writer of the thirteenth century, "are

Missionaries preach among them.

---

[1] At the time of which we are speaking the Count of Languedoc, while nominally subject to the French Crown, was practically independent. His suzerainty was recognised by the Viscounts of Narbonne, Beziers, Foix, Montpellier, and Quercy.

[2] Milman, v. 407.

in ruins, baptism refused, the Eucharist held in execration, penance despised, the sacraments abolished, and the doctrine of two principles introduced."

Crusade preached against Raymond of Toulouse.

The assassination of one of the Papal legates, in 1208, by two of Raymond's retainers, and with his connivance,[1] led to the adoption of more stringent measures against himself and the sectaries that he had taken under his protection. Innocent excommunicated the murderers of the legate, as well as their abettors, among whom Raymond was specially named; and commissioned Arnold, Abbot of Citeaux, to preach a Crusade against him and the Albigenses. Raymond had not only favoured the Albigenses, and approved of the murder of the Papal legate, but had also oppressed the Church in various ways, especially by the confiscation of ecclesiastical property.

He seeks reconciliation with the Church.

Raymond, on hearing that a Crusade was being organized against him, sought to avert it by feigning sorrow for his past conduct, and asking to have a legate sent to Toulouse to reconcile him with the Church. Innocent, who was only anxious for peace, acceded to his request. Raymond promised to amend his life, to restore the property of the Church that he had seized, and not to protect the Albigenses, upon which he was released from the ban of excommunication.

The Crusade organized.

Raymond, however, having failed to keep his promises, the threatened Crusade was organized by Arnold, and placed under the command of Simon, Count of Montfort. After a war extending over five years (1209-14), the power of the Albigenses and their protectors was

[1] Raymond retained the murderers in his service after it was publicly known that they were guilty.

completely broken; and Simon was declared Lord of the conquered territory by the Council of Montpellier, in 1214. Its decision was ratified in the following year by the fourth General Council of Lateran.

The most noteworthy incident in the campaign was the capture of Beziers, one of the chief strongholds of the Albigenses. It held out for some time against the attacks of the Crusaders; but was at length taken by assault, on the 22nd July, 1209, and most of the inhabitants put to death. A story is handed down, on the authority of a contemporary Cistercian, named Caesar of Heisterbach,[1] that the Abbot Arnold was asked by some of the Crusading leaders what was to be done with the inhabitants of the town, when captured, there being among them some Orthodox Christians; upon which he is said to have replied: "Slay all! God will know His own." The capture of

This is one of the sensational and incredible stories of which Caesar's work, the *Dialogue on Miracles* is full. It is completely at variance with the accounts of the siege handed down to us by Arnold, in his letter[2] to Innocent III., and by Peter,[3] a monk of Vaux-de-Cernay, the historian of the Albigensian war, both of whom state that the city was taken after an obstinate struggle, and that the massacre was entirely owing to the infuriated state of the Crusaders.[4] Charge against Arnold.

The war was renewed in 1216, by Raymond, who,

---

[1] *Dial. Mirac.*, v., c. 21.

[2] In the letter forwarded to the Pope by Arnold, announcing the capture of the stronghold, it is said that there were 20,000 killed.

[3] *Loco Citato.*

[4] *Hist. Albigensium*, c. 15.

[5] See Hurter, *Life of Innocent III.*, ii. 389.

Renewal of the war (1216).

assisted by many of his former subjects, endeavoured to depose Simon of Montfort. The latter received a mortal wound, in 1218, while endeavouring to regain possession of Toulouse, recently captured by Raymond; and died a few days afterwards, bequeathing his possessions to his son, Amaury. His successor, however, unable to maintain his claims against the superior forces of his rival, transferred his rights to the King of France, in 1225. The war continued till 1229, when peace[1] was concluded between Raymond VII., who had succeeded his father, in 1222, and Louis IX. The former handed over to Louis a good portion of the territory held by his father, and pledged himself to recognise the suzerainty of the French Crown,

Treaty between Louis IX. and Raymond VII. (1229).

to protect the rights of the Church against the sectaries of Languedoc, and to found a Catholic university in Toulouse to counteract the influence of heretical teachers. He also promised to give his daughter to the King's brother; and engaged that, in case they died without lawful issue, their possessions should be annexed to the Crown of France. As a security for the fulfiment of these promises, Louis was to retain, for ten years, Narbonne and several other strongholds in Raymond's territory.

B.—*The Waldenses.*

The founder of this sect is generally said to have been Peter Waldo,[2] a wealthy merchant of Lyons. Feeling

---

[1] Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, ii. 485.

[2] A greater antiquity has been claimed for the sect by some Protestant writers, who trace their origin back to the time of the Apostles—influenced no doubt, by the desire of thereby supplying the missing link in the historical succession of Protestantism. But this view has been so completely exploded in recent times, that no writer of note can be any longer found to defend it.

disconsolate at the sudden death of one of his fellow-citizens, to whom he was specially attached, he endeavoured to find consolation in spiritual reading and meditation, with the result that he sold, in 1160, his property, and distributed his money among the poor. Though a layman, and, therefore, forbidden to interfere with the duties of the clergy, he undertook to preach to the people about Lyons, and employed a popular scholar to translate the Gospels into the vernacular tongue for their instruction.

Peter Waldo.

In his preaching he inveighed strongly against the wealth and negligence of the clergy. He sent his disciples, two and two, through the country, enjoining on them to instruct the people, and to lead lives of strict poverty. The earnestness of Peter and his disciples, as well as the austerities which they professed to practise, secured for them a large number of followers, who were known as the *Poor Men of Lyons* and the *Humble Ones*.

His followers.

The Waldenses were forbidden to preach by the Archbishop of Lyons, as they had received no commission from the Church. Against this prohibition, they appealed to Alexander III., who supported the Archbishop. Regardless, however, of ecclesiastical injunctions, they pursued their course, saying, that they had to obey God rather than man. Lucius III. (1181-85), Alexander's successor, to whom

Forbidden to preach.

They become openly schismatical (1184).

Giesler says (*Eccl. Hist.*, iii. 412) that it had its origin in the claim urged by the Waldenses to the possession of true Apostolic doctrine, whence it was inferred by some that they claimed an Apostolic origin. The chief argument formerly urged in favour of the antiquity of the sect was taken from a Waldensian document, known as the *Noble Lesson*, which was said to have been written, at least, before the twelfth century. It has, however, been conclusively established by Herzog and other critics, that this document does not date back further than the fourteenth century. See *Recherches Historiques sur la Veritable Origine des Vaudois*. (Paris, 1836.)

they renewed their appeal, excommunicated them and other sectaries of the south of France, at the Council of Verona (1184), for daring to preach without authority. The excommunication of Lucius was treated with the same contempt as the previous prohibition of Alexander. Henceforth they became openly schismatical.

Innocent III. tries to reconcile them with the Church.

When Innocent III. became Pope, they renewed their application to be allowed to preach. The Pope, who entertained a hope of gaining them back to the Church, replied by praising their poverty and austere lives, and allowed them to form a kind of religious society; but forbade them to preach. His efforts, however, to make them recognise the rights of the clergy were fruitless. They continued to preach, and spread rapidly in Southern France, Spain, and Italy.

They add heresy to schism.

Like all schismatics, they soon added heresy to schism. (*a*) They denied the authority of the Holy See; (*b*) they taught that the Church to which Christ's promises of indefectibility, &c., were made, was an invisible society; (*c*) they claimed for laymen the right to administer the Sacrament of Penance, and consecrate the Eucharist in case of necessity; (*d*) Image worship, Purgatory, and the veneration of the saints were rejected; and (*e*) they maintained that the state of grace in the minister was necessary for the valid administration of the sacraments.

The Waldenses, who were far superior in moral character to the other sectaries of their age, were severely persecuted during the thirteenth century, and were obliged to take

[1] Thus Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay says (*Hist. Albig.*, c. 2): "Erant praeterea alii haeretici qui Valdenses dicebantur, sed comparatione aliorum haereticorum longe minus perversi. In multis enim nobiscum conveniebant; in aliquibus dissentiebant."

refuge in Bohemia and Piedmont In the former country they became merged in the Hussites of the fifteenth, and the so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century; while, in the latter, they continue as a distinct sect down to the present day, their number being reckoned at about twenty thousand. The Waldense persecuted.

C.—*The Petrobrusians.*

Peter de Bruis, the founder of this sect, was a deposed priest of Southern France, of whom we know little or nothing, till he appeared as a so-called reformer, about 1104. (*a*) He rejected infant baptism: (*b*) he condemned churches as unnecessary, as God hears the prayers of His creatures wherever they are offered: (*c*) he denied the doctrine of the Real Presence: and (*d*) he maintained that no respect should be paid to the cross, as it is the memorial of Christ's sufferings. These errors were refuted by Peter the Venerable of Clugny, to whose writings we are chiefly indebted for our information about Peter de Bruis and his followers. The teaching of Peter de Bruis.

Having played the *rôle* of reformer for about twenty years, during which he gained a considerable number of followers in the south of France, he was seized one day by an infuriated mob at St. Gilles, near Arles, and committed (1124) to the flames which he had prepared to destroy crosses and other pious objects he had collected. His end

Peter was followed in the same district by a deacon named Henry, who is represented by some as an Italian, and by others as a native of Switzerland. In his earlier years he took the religious habit in Clugny; but after some time, left his monastic home, intending to devote his life to the reformation of fallen women. The austerities Henry of Lausanne.

which he professed to practise, and his fluency as a preacher, secured for him considerable influence, and for a time some success. He at first selected Switzerland as the scene of his labours, Lausanne being his favourite resort—hence frequently he is styled Henry of Lausanne.

He openly assails the clergy.

From Switzerland he passed into France, adout 1117. The Bishop of Le Mans, being at first deceived dy his professions of zeal and piety, allowed him to preach in his diocese. But soon finding that his indulgence had been abused by Henry to excite the laity against the priests, he expelled the impostor from his diocese. Henceforth, Henry used whatever influence he possessed to discredit the clergy and spread the errors of Peter de Bruis.

His twofold imprisonment.

Having been arrested, in 1135, as a heretic, he was brought before Innocent II. at the Council of Pisa. The Pope committed him to the custody of St. Bernard, who afterwards released him on his undertaking not to return to his former course of conduct. But, having violated his engagements, he was again arrested by the Bishop of Toulouse, in 1148, and sent to Rheims, where Eugene III was at that time presiding at a council. Here he was condemned to imprisonment for life.

St. Bernard preaches against the Petrobrusians, &c.

At the request of Eugene III., St. Bernard preached against the Petrobrusians and other sectaries in the south of France. During his stay here, he performed numerous miracles in proof of his mission ; but the wonderful change that he effected in the religious condition of the people was the greatest of his miracles.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INQUISITION.

Meaning of the term.

THE Inquisition, taken in its more general sense, may be described as a tribunal established in the Church for the detection and suppression of heresy. Understood in this sense it is as old as the Christian religion. For it has been always regarded as the first duty of the episcopal office to guard the purity of the deposit of the faith. During the first three centuries, when the civil power was opposed to Christianity, ecclesiastical penalties alone could be used against heresy. When, however, the Gospel became the religion of the State, after the conversion of Constantine the Great, heresy was frequently punished as a civil offence, as appears in the case of the Donatists and Priscillianists.

Its usual meaning.

But when writers speak of the Inquisition they invariably use the term in a more definite and restricted sense, to mean one or other of two tribunals established for the special purpose of extirpating heresy; viz., the Roman, or Ecclesiastical Inquisition, and the Spanish Inquisition. Of these we shall treat under separate heads.

The Roman Inquisition.

Its purpose.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries numerous heretics, as we have seen, made their appearance in southern Europe, who taught errors subversive of civil society, maltreated the clergy, both secular and regular, destroyed churches and monasteries, and desecrated objects

held in veneration by all orthodox Christians. For the suppression of these sectaries, dangerous alike to Church and State, the Roman Inquisition was established.

Date of its origin.

The date of its origin is the subject of considerable controversy. Some refer it to the third General Council of Lateran (1179); others, to the Council of Verona (1184); others, to the fourth General Council of Lateran (1215); and others, in fine, to the Council of Toulouse (1229). While admitting that each of these opinions possesses an element of truth, we prefer to hold that it does not owe its origin to any one Council, but that it was the growth of time; that each of the councils mentioned contributed to its institution by sanctioning the principles on which its constitution was based; and that its organization was finally completed by the Council of Toulouse, in 1229.

Decree of third Council of Lateran 1179).

The third General Council of Lateran, in condemning the sectaries that infested the south of France, distinguished between two classes; viz., such as were satisfied with proclaiming their errors in public, and those who had recourse to violence in the propagation of their views. The former were excommunicated, and Christians forbidden to hold any intercourse with them; while the latter were declared liable to various civil penalties, such as imprisonment and the confiscation of their property, "because they practised great cruelties against the orthodox, not respecting either age or sex, widows or orphans, churches or monasteries, and destroyed and desecrated everything after the manner of Pagans."[1]

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vi., pars. ii., 1683. The teaching of this council regarding the treatment of heretics had been already laid down by various provincial councils held during the twelfth century, such as those of Toulouse (1119), Rheims (1148), and Tours (1163), at each of which a Pope presided.

The Council of Verona, held in 1184, at which Lucius III. presided, decreed—(*a*) that all bishops should make an annual visitation of those parts of their dioceses in which sectaries were supposed to exist, and summon persons before their tribunal to give evidence against such as they knew to be heterodox; and (*b*) that the State was bound to assist bishops in suppressing heresy by giving effect to their decisions. These decrees were sanctioned by the fourth General Council of Lateran. Now for the first time was it defined that the State is bound, when required, to assist the Church in putting down errors against faith.

Decree of the Council of Verona (1184).

Finally, a special tribunal was established by the Council of Toulouse, held in 1229, under the presidency of Cardinal Romanus, as Papal legate, to give effect to the teaching of previous councils. The new tribunal was to consist of a bishop as president, and some assistants from among the clergy. For their guidance a code of laws was drawn up consisting of fifteen chapters.[1] Various civil penalties were decreed against those convicted of heresy, as well as their protectors, the severest being imprisonment and the confiscation of their property.[2]

Ecclesiastical Inquisition fully established by the Council of Toulouse (1229).

Those declared guilty of holding heterodox opinions were handed over to the civil power, to be dealt with according to the law of the country. Though the sentence

[1] Viz., the first fifteen of the forty-five decrees passed by the council. Hard., *Coll. Con.*, vii. 178.

[2] Capital punishment for heresy has never been sanctioned by t he Church On the contrary, it appears to be condemned by the majority of her great teachers, such as St. Augustine, St. Martin of Tours, and St. Bernard. Its lawfulness, however, is defended by St. Thomas and many other Catholic writers. The former says (*Summa Theol.*, ii. 2, q. ii., a. 3): "Unde si falsarii pecuniae vel alii malefactores statim per saeculares principes juste morti traduntur multo magis haeretici statim ex quo de haerese convincuntur, possunt non solum excommunicari sed et juste occidi."

Heretics sometimes put to death by the State.

of death was never pronounced against anyone by the inquisitorial tribunals, that penalty was sometimes inflicted by the State. This was not, however, the result of any ecclesiastical enactment, but of the laws of particular countries, in which heresy was punished as one of the gravest offences of which man could be guilty.

The custom introduced during the eleventh and twelfth centuries

The custom of treating heresy as a capital offence appears to have been introduced into different states of Europe in the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[1] This was chiefly owing to the character of the heresies then prevalent, and to the intimate union existing at the time between the Church and State in virtue of which an offence against the one was treated as an offence against the other. The custom was made a law of the German Empire, by a decree issued by Frederick II. in 1224. Frederick's example was soon followed by the rulers of other countries, and his action was formally approved by the Theological Faculty of the Paris University in 1226.

Dominicans get control of the Inquistion (1248)

Bishops did not retain the control of the Inquisition long. It was soon found that the numerous other duties they had to perform, as well as personal considerations frequently prevented them from exposing the heretics of their dioceses. Hence Innocent IV. resolved to man the tribunal by other officials who would not be prevented by either of these causes from discharging their inquisitorial duties. He addressed a letter to St. Raymond of Pennaforte, in 1248, announcing his "intention of entrusting the management of the Inquisition to the Dominicans, who had

[1] There had been isolated cases of capital punishment for heresy before the eleventh century; but they were not such as could be said to constitute a custom.

been sent by Providence to assist in extirpating heresy." From this time the Dominicans became the chief officials of the inquisitorial courts which were introduced into almost every country of Europe before the end of the thirteenth century. The Inquisition was never established in England, where heretics were proceeded against by the ordinary tribunals of the country; with, however, the same, if not greater, severity.

The Ecclesiastical Inquisition disappeared everywhere during the sixteenth century, except in Italy, where it still continues, under the name of the Holy Office, whose chief duty is to inquire into the orthodoxy of books, and condemn them if found to contain any doctrine against faith or morals.

The Ecclesiastical Inquisition disappears in different countries.

Having described the origin, purpose, and constitution of the Ecclesiastical Inquisition, it remains for us to consider how far the charge of religious intolerance, levelled against the Church, because of this tribunal, can be sustained. It may be said with truth, that no institution has brought so much obloquy on the name of the Catholic Church, in the minds of anti-Catholics, as the Inquisition. The bare mention of the term recalls to their minds the stake and every other species of torture, and is too often appealed to as a sufficient argument to condemn the authority that sanctioned it, as opposed to human liberty and progress, and unfit to survive in a liberal and enlightened age.

The Catholic Church charged with religious intolerance.

The charge of religious intolerance against the Church is based on a complete misconception of the nature of religious intolerance, of the mission of the Church and her relations to the State, and of the difference between the Middle Ages and more recent times, in regard to the severity

The charge considered.

of corporal punishment. It admits of various answers. The following will be sufficient for our purpose :—

All forms of religion intolerant.

First. If religious intolerance be a charge, it is one to which every religion that ever existed must plead guilty, from the oldest form of Paganism to the latest development of Protestantism. The history of the Catholic Church is a sufficient witness of the intolerance of the different forms of belief, with which she has been brought in contact. Nor can infidelity itself claim exemption from the general charge. For who were more intolerant than Voltaire and those who wrote with him?

Universal religious toleration indefensible.

Secondly. Universal religious toleration is as indefensible in theory as it has been found impossible in practice. A man is said to tolerate religious error when he can put an end to it, but, for some reason or another, fails to do so. Such toleration is incompatible with the love of truth and the obligations of charity. And the more one loves religious truth, and the spiritual interests of his neighbour, the more must he seek, within the limits of justice and prudence, to stamp out heterodoxy. Hence must the Catholic Church, "the pillar and the ground of truth," be ever intolerant of heresy, as truth must be of error.

The present age said to be tolerant.

The present age is said to be *tolerant*. The word is misapplied. It is just as intolerant as any previous age. The professors of each creed still use whatever means they can to propagate their views. We admit, indeed, that physical punishment is no longer used in enforcing uniformity of belief. But is this the result of a greater toleration? Is it not rather the result of the impossibility of having recourse to such punishment, owing to the indefinite number of sects into which Christendom is now divided? England tried it for three centuries, and was at

length obliged to abandon it, because of its failure to attain its purpose.

Thirdly. The action of the Church in using the State during the Middle Ages to punish religious dissent can be easily defended on sound principles of theology and canon law. These principles may be thus briefly stated:— The Church defended on the principles of theology and canon law.

(*a*) The Church was founded by Christ to propagate the Gospel, to preserve intact the deposit of faith, and to secure the salvation of men.

(*b*) The Church is a perfect society,[1] in the sense that she received from her Divine Founder[2] the authority required for the fulfilment of her mission. This authority, which is primarily spiritual, is also temporal in so far as such may be needed to attain its end.

(*c*) The State is also a perfect society, established for the immediate purpose of promoting man's temporal interests, endowed with authority to punish evil,[3] and perfectly independent within its own sphere of action. Constitution of the Church and State and their mutual relations

(*d*) There should be a union[4] between the Church and State as between the two great constituent elements of one moral body, each working in its proper sphere for the common good.

---

[1] The following proposition was condemned by Pius IX. (*Syllabus*, n. 19):—"Ecclesia non est vera perfectaque societas."

[2] He thus addressed the Apostles in giving them their mission:—"All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations."—St. Matthew, xxviii. 18, 19.

[3] "For he [the civil ruler] is God's minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear; for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God's minister; an avenger to execute wrath upon him that *doth evil*."—Rom. xiii. 4.

[4] The following proposition was condemned by Pius IX.:—"Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia sejungendus est." (*Syllabus*, n. 28). For an authoritative exposition of the relations between the Church and State, see the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII.

(*e*) This union must be effected by subordination[1] of the one to the other, and not by co-ordination. For the latter would require that a third authority should be established on earth to which disputes between the Church and State would be referred for settlement.

(*f*) As one of the powers must therefore be subordinate to the other, it follows, as a matter of course, that the spiritual should rule, at least so far as to define the limits of its authority, and direct the movements of the State according to the law of God as the human soul directs the body.[2]

The Church can punish heresy through the State.

From these principles it follows:—(*a*) that the State can punish heresy as an evil in itself and as an offence against the Church;[3] and (*b*) the Church can require the assistance of the State in suppressing heresy, if its interference be deemed necessary for the good of society. This, however, would occur only in exceptional circumstances.

From the fact that the Catholic State can consistently punish religious dissent, it by no means follows that a Protestant State can do the same. For the former has the

---

[1] Thus Stahl, Protestant Professor in Berlin, in writing on this subject says:—"Unum aut alterum debet esse; aut indirecta potestas Papae super res saeculares; aut indirecta potestas principis saecularis super res ecclesiasticas. Non est tertium." Quoted by L. de Hammerstein, S.J., *De Ecclesia et Statu*, page 118.

[2] St. Thomas says (*Summa*, ii. 2, q. 60, n. 3): "Potestas saecularis, subditur spirituali sicut corpus animae, et ideo non est usurpatum judicium si spiritualis praelatus se intromittat in temporalibus quantum ad ea in quibus ei subditur temporalis potestas." And Bellarmine writes (*De Pontif. Rom.* v. cap. 7):—"Finis temporalis subordinatur fini spirituali quia felicitas non est absolute ultimus finis, et ideo referri debet in felicitatem aeternam . . . Non recte asseritur spiritualia pendere a temporalibus; ergo temporalia a spiritualibus pendent illisque subjiciuntur."

[3] Most of the medieval heresies could also be punished as injurious to the State. Canonists do not appear to be agreed as to whether all heresies can be treated in like manner.

guarantee of infallibility on its side in deciding what is heresy; while the latter repudiates any such privilege in its Church.

Reasons why medieval heretics were severely treated.

In judging of the severity with which medieval sectaries were treated, we should remember—(*a*) the character of their errors, which were too often subversive of social order and civil government; (*b*) the intimate union then existing between Church and State, in virtue of which an offence against the one was treated as an offence against the other; (*c*) that the Gospel was at the time the basis of every civil constitution throughout Christendom, so that rebellion against God was viewed as rebellion against the State; and (*d*) the difference between the criminal law of the Middle Ages and that of modern times, of which we shall have more presently.

B.—*The Spanish Inquisition.*

Generally attacked by anti-Catholics.

When Protestant writers taunt Catholics with the horrors of the Inquisition, they invariably have before their minds the Spanish Inquisition, forgetting that the latter was, as we shall show, a purely State tribunal, and that, therefore, the Church cannot be held responsible for its actions.

The Roman Inquisition in Spain.

The Roman or Ecclesiastical Inquisition was introduced into Spain shortly after its establishment. But it gradually fell into disuse in that country during the fifteenth century till the commencement of Ferdinand[1] and Isabella's reign, when it had almost totally disappeared.

[1] Ferdinand, usually styled the Catholic, was born in 1452. He was the son of John II. of Aragon, and married Isabella (1451-1504), daughter of the King of Castile and Leon, in 1469. Isabella succeeded to the throne of her father on the death of her brother, Henry, IV., in 1474; while Ferdinand succeeded to that of Aragon, five years later, on the death of his father. And thus the two crowns became united in their persons. The conquest of Granada, in 1492, and of Navarre, in 1512, united the whole of Spain under one ruler.

Spanish Inquisition established (1481).

A new tribunal was, however, established by the Spanish sovereigns, in 1481, for the purpose of destroying the power of the traditional enemies of their country; viz., the Moors and the Jews. To understand its purpose and necessity, it will be necessary for us to consider briefly the condition of Spain at the time.

Condition of Spain at the time.

After a struggle of nearly eight centuries the Spanish Christians were fast asserting their independence over the Mohammedans. They might long since have expelled the infidel invaders, but for the division of Christian Spain into a number of petty kingdoms.[1] This source of weakness was, to a great extent, removed by Ferdinand and Isabella, by whom Castile, Aragon, and Leon,[2] were united into one kingdom. These sovereigns, taught by the sad experience of the past, refused to allow the Mohammedans to remain in their dominions. Many of them, however, sought to escape expulsion by receiving baptism and professing themselves Christians, while they remained devoted to the Prophet at heart, and conspired with his followers against the power of the Christian sovereigns.

The Moors.

The Jews.

The Jews were also regarded as enemies of Christian Spain. They had settled down in large numbers in that country at an early date. For we find the Council of Elvira (305) decreeing that Christians should not have their lands blessed by Jews;[3] that neither priest nor layman should hold any intercourse with them;[4] and that

---

[1] The following were the Christian principalities in Spain, in the twelfth century, according to the order of their foundation:—Leon, Navarre, Castile, and Aragon.

[2] Leon had been already united to Castile, in 1230.

[3] Can. xlix.

[4] Can. l.

none of the faithful should contract marriage with them.[1]

They frequently entered into plots against the Christians in Spain. Thus they formed an alliance with the Saracens, in the course of the seventh century, for the purpose of establishing a Jewish kingdom in that country. But fortunately the plot was discovered before it was fully matured, and the organizers of it severely punished. They continued, however, in large numbers in the country, their power being steadily on the increase till the fourteenth century, when they had most of the offices of trust and emolument in their hands. This condition of things aroused the indignation of the Christians, and gave rise to civil commotions, which resulted in severe penal laws being enacted against the Jews. To escape the effects of these laws many of them pretended to embrace Christianity, while they continued to be Jews at heart and to work in the interests of their race.

Frequently conspire against the Christians.

Many of them become Christians in name.

Those false converts used their position to make proselytes to Judaism; and we are told[3] that many of them even became priests and bishops to obtain greater facilities for propagating their errors. And they went so far, in 1473, as to endeavour to get possession of Gibraltar, the key of Spain. The Christians soon realized what a source of danger these Jewish converts were to the unity and political greatness of their country, and presented a petition, in 1477, to Ferdinand and Isabella, requesting them to have recourse to stronger measures than any yet adopted to prevent the continuance of the danger. The Spanish

These false converts a source of danger to the State.

---

[1] Can. xvi., Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, i. 250.

[2] Hefele, *Life of Card. Ximenez* (Engl. ed.), 293.

[3] *Ibidem*, 296.

sovereigns, yielding to the petition of their subjects, wrote in the course of the following year to Sixtus IV., asking for permission to introduce the Inquisition into their dominions as the best means of dealing with pretended converts. The Pope replied in a Bull, dated 1478, authorizing the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal, consisting of "two or three dignitaries of the Church, who might be either seculars or regulars, according to the wish of the sovereigns, provided the said dignitaries were at least forty years of age, of pure morals, bachelors of theology, or doctors of canon law."[1]

Sixtus IV. authorizes the establishment of the Inquisition

The first tribunal of the Spanish Inquisition was established at Seville, in 1481, the statutes regulating it being issued by the sovereigns. It was not fully organized till 1483, when Thomas Torquemada, Prior of the Dominican monastery at Santa Cruz, was appointed Inquisitor-General for Castile and Aragon. He established three additional tribunals at Cordova, Jaen, and Villa-Real, the last of which was afterwards removed to Toledo. It is said[2] that during

Thomas Torquemada becomes Inquisitor-General.

[1] *Ibidem*, 299.

[2] The charges of cruelty against the Spanish Inquisition rest chiefly on the authority of Llorente. This reviler of his country's institutions was born in Calahorra, in 1756. After being ordained priest, he filled some offices of trust in his native diocese for some time, and was appointed Secretary to the Inquisition, at Madrid, in 1789. From this office he was dismissed three years later, on account of his misconduct. But he shortly afterwards succeeded in regaining the favour of the ruling power in Spain, by writing against the liberty of the Basque Provinces, and was restored to his former office in 1805.

When Napoleon invaded Spain, in 1808, and placed his brother, Joseph, on the throne, Llorente sought to ingratiate himself with the conquerors by attacking everything Spanish. For this he was obliged to fly from the country on the restoration of Ferdinand VII., in 1814, and took up his residence in Paris, where he wrote his *Critical History of the Inquisition*. He professed to derive his information from the authentic records of that tribunal which he had in his possession. But his conduct in destroying

the fifteen years of its sway (1483-98) thousands were put to death on the charge of heresy, and that his policy was strictly adhered to by his successor, Diego Deza (1499-1506).

Many of the Moors embrace Christianity in name.

On the conquest of Granada, in 1492, the last stronghold of the Moors in Spain, all who remained in the country were promised freedom of worship. But as they revolted shortly afterwards, they were commanded either to leave the country or embrace Christianity. The number of pretended conversions resulting from this decree gave sufficient occupation to the Inquisitors for many years. The Inquisition continued in Spain till the present century, when it was abolished by the first constitutional government elected in that country, in 1813.

The Popes endeavour to moderate the Spanish Inquisition.

The Holy See frequently used its influence to moderate the severity of the Spanish Inquisition, but apparently without much effect. Thus Sixtus IV., in a brief dated 1482, complained that the Bull sanctioning the establishment of the Inquisition had been obtained under false pretences, and added that it was only consideration for Ferdinand and Isabella that prevented him from deposing two Inquisitors because of their harshness towards those brought before their tribunal. In the following year he issued two additional briefs, one granting an appeal from

---

the records—apparently lest his falsehoods could be disproved—must excite suspicion in the minds of all who are not blinded by prejudice. Moreover, the partisan spirit in which the work is written is so obvious from every page, that many Protestant writers, such as Ranke and Prescott, declare that it possesses very little historical authority.

Llorente wrote many other works, some of which are immoral and libellous. A satirical book written by him against the Popes led to his expulsion from France, in 1822, after which he returned to Spain. He died at Madrid in the course of the following year.

the Inquisitors to the Archbishop of Seville, and the other, which appeared shortly afterwards, granting an appeal to Rome. This latter privilege was, however, rendered useless by the opposition of the sovereigns. And Leo X. was only prevented, in 1519, from adopting strong measures against the Inquisitors by the threat of the Spanish minister that his sovereign, Charles V., would join the Lutherans if the Pope persisted in carrying out his schemes of reform.

The Spanish Inquisition a State Tribunal.

The Church cannot be held responsible for the harshness of the Spanish Inquisition, which was a State rather than an ecclesiastical institution. Its political character will sufficiently appear from the following considerations:—

(*a*) Its officials were Civil functionaries.

First. The Inquisitor-General, who named the other officials, was appointed by the Spanish sovereigns, and could be dismissed by them at pleasure. The approval of the Holy See was asked, but it was merely as a matter of form, for the kings of Spain made it quite clear, by their conduct on various occasions, that they were ready to dispense with the Papal approval, if refused. Ferdinand's opinion regarding the civil character of the Inquisitors is sufficiently indicated by his reply to Cardinal Ximenez, when the latter objected to the appointment of lay officials. "Do you not know," said he, "that if the council has any jurisdiction whatever, it is owing to the king?" From the fact that most of the Inquisitors were priests, it cannot be concluded that the tribunal manned by them was ecclesiastical. For they acted in their civil capacity, and not as agents of the Church. It should be borne in mind that at the time many of the highest civil offices in Christendom were filled by ecclesiastics.

Secondly. The statutes regulating the Spanish Inquisi-

tion were issued in the names of the sovereigns from whom they also received their authority. Thus, such forms of expression as "Their Highnesses will," "Their Highnesses command," &c., are of frequent occurrence; while there is not the slightest allusion to the authority of the Church.

(*b*) Its Statutes were issued by the Sovereigns.

Thirdly. The Spanish Inquisition was used in putting down those who were considered dangerous to the peace and prosperity of the State. It was first used against the Jews and Moors, the traditional enemies of Spain. It was afterwards used by Philip II., to prevent the introduction of Protestantism, and with it a repetition of those religious wars that were distracting other countries. And at a still later date it was used by the Bourbon princes, to check the power of their vassals, and complete the absolutism of the crown. Therefore it is that Segni says[1] that "the Inquisition has been invented to rob the rich of their possessions and the mighty of their authority." Hence it was abolished, in 1813, with the absolute Monarchy, of which it was considered the strongest support.

(*c*) It was used against the enemies of the State.

Fourthly. All property confiscated in consequence of the decisions of the Inquisition was handed over to the sovereigns. Thus, during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the proceeds of the confiscations filled the royal treasury, which had been exhausted by the Moorish wars; and thereby enabled them to engage in those memorable enterprises associated with their names.

(*d*) The proceeds of the confiscations went to the royal treasury.

We cannot, therefore, be surprised to find that the political character of the Inquisition is fully admitted by many Protestant writers. Ranke, for instance, says[2]: "I

[1] Quoted by Hefele, *Life of Card. Ximenez*, 318.

[2] *Fürsten und Völker der Sud. Europas*, vol. i., p. 243.

Political character of Spanish Inquisition admitted by Protestants.

am much mistaken if the result of the facts adduced by him (Llorente) does not show that the Inquisition was only a royal tribunal, furnished with spiritual weapons." And Guizot writes[1] that "the Inquisition was at first more political than ecclesiastical, and intended rather to uphold order than defend the faith."

That our estimate of the Spanish Inquisition may be just and equitable, we must bear the following points in mind :—

Considerations to be borne in mind in judging the Spanish Inquisition.

(*a*) It was used as a political weapon against those who were considered the enemies of the State. The punishment of such persons is not forbidden even by the much-lauded toleration of the nineteenth century.

(*b*) The criminal law of the Middle Ages was much more severe than that of recent times. Many offences[2] which are now considered comparatively trivial by the State, were then punished by death; *e.g.*, blasphemy, forgery, burglary, &c.

(*c*) The Inquisition never pronounced sentence of death against culprits. But, after declaring them guilty of heresy, handed them over to the State, to be punished according to the laws of the country.

Capital punishment for heresy approved by the so-called Reformers.

(*d*) The early Reformers themselves admitted the lawfulness of putting heretics to death. Thus Calvin had the Spanish physician, Michael Servetus, burned as a heretic at the stake in Geneva (1553), and wrote his work, *Fidelis Expositio Errorum Michaelis Serveti*, in defence of his conduct. His action met with the full approval of Melanchthon, the ablest of the Reformers. For the latter,

[1] *Cours d'Histoire Moderne*, v., Dissert. ii.

[2] Hefele, *Life of Card. Ximenez*, 325.

writing to Calvin, shortly after the death of Servetus, says:—"I quite agree with your opinion, and maintain that your tribunal has acted with justice, in having, after due investigation, put a blasphemer to death."[1] And if the principles of the Protestants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are to be gathered from their actions, it is but too clear, that they admitted the lawfulness of visiting religious dissent with every form of punishment that cruelty itself could suggest.

Whatever may be said against the Spanish Inquisition, propriety would at least require that those should not be the first to attack it who have to answer for the horrors of the Star Chamber and the High Commission Court.

[1] *Ibi'em*, 327.

CHAPTER XIV.

PONTIFICATE OF BONIFACE VIII. (1294-1303).

Boniface resolves to maintain the rights and privileges of the Papacy.

THE decline of the Papal power from the height to which it had been raised by Gregory VII. and Innocent III. may be said to date from the pontificate of Boniface VIII. The latter entertained the same exalted notions of his authority in ecclesiastical and civil matters as his illustrious predecessors. But he soon found that times had very much altered, and that the nations of Europe, ever anxious for a change, had begun to grow weary of the rule of the Popes. Boniface, however, resolved to maintain, as far as possible, the rights and privileges of the Papacy as they had been handed down to him; and was thereby involved in a number of quarrels, which continued to distract his entire pontificate. As we should expect, these quarrels created for him numerous enemies, who brought various charges against him both during his life and after his death.

Celestine V.

To understand the origin of some of the troubles in which he was involved, as well as of the charges levelled against his character, it will be necessary to notice briefly the pontificate of his predecessor, Celestine V.

On the death of Nicholas IV. (1288-92), the Holy See remained vacant for two years and three months. The twelve cardinals of whom the Sacred College consisted were

divided into two factions;[1] viz., the French or Neapolitan and the Italian, each of which clung obstinately to its own candidate, thereby rendering it impossible for anyone to receive the required majority of votes. At length, after various meetings had been held at different places, the cardinals came together at Perugia, and unanimously gave their votes in favour of a saintly hermit, named Peter, who lived in a narrow cell in the rock of Murrone, near Sulmona, and had acquired considerable fame by having founded a brotherhood of hermits. When the news of his election reached him, he refused at first to receive the dignity; but after having consulted God in prayer, he consented, and was proclaimed Pope on the 5th of July, 1294.

His election.

Celestine, while held in high repute for his piety, lacked the experience of the world and administrative tact required for a man in his exalted office. From the very commencement of his pontificate he fell under the sway of the designing Charles II. of Naples. For instance, he refused to accede to the request of the cardinals, to go to Perugia for consecration; but had the ceremony performed at Aquila, in Neapolitan territory. And, instead of going to Rome, fixed his residence at Naples. He further showed his subserviency to French influence by creating thirteen cardinals, of whom seven were French and three Neapolitans. And, finally, he conferred the archbishopric of Lyons on Charles's son, who was at the time only twenty years of age.

Falls under the influence of Charles II. of Naples.

---

[1] The leading spirit among the cardinals in the French interest was Matthew Orsini; while the head of the rival party was James Colonna.

[2] They had been approved by Gregory X. (1271-76); and afterwards took the name of Celestines, in memory of their founder.

The members of his religious brotherhood.

Celestine was also unduly influenced by the members of his religious brotherhood. Thus, he named two of them to the cardinalate, an office for which they were by no means qualified by their training and education. And his simplicity was frequently taken advantage of by some of them, as well as by other faithless officials, to secure his signature to documents raising their own favourites to positions of emolument in the Church.[1]

Leads a life of seclusion and prayer.

Celestine resolved to lead as far as possible the same kind of life as Pope to which he had been accustomed as hermit. For this purpose he had a cell constructed in his palace like that in which he had lived at Murrone. Here he spent the most of his time in prayer and other ascetical exercises. He soon discovered, however, that the multifarious duties which he was obliged to perform interfered very much with his accustomed devotions. This, joined to his conviction, which was daily growing stronger of his unfitness for the exalted office which he filled, suggested to him the advisability of resigning the Papacy.[2] After consulting some of the cardinals, he finally made up his mind to abdicate. Many, however, influenced by motives of self-interest, sought to dissuade him from carrying out his intention. And some went even so far as to maintain that he could not resign, there being no superior who

---

[1] It sometimes happened, we are told, that three or four persons were thus appointed to the same benefice.

[2] We are told by James of Stephaneschi, in his *Life of Celestine V.*, iii., c. 3, first published in the *Acta Sanctorum*, May 19, vol. xv., 437-83, that the proposal to resign first came from Celestine himself. James of Stephaneschi was contemporary with Celestine, from whom he received many marks of favour. He was afterwards created cardinal by Boniface VIII. *Acta Sanct.*, xv. 419-20.

could accept his resignation. Having asked the opinion of some learned canonists on the point, he issued a Bull, declaring that the cardinals were competent to accept the resignation of a Pope. Having thus prepared the way, he resigned the Papacy on the 13th December, after a short reign of about five months. His resignation.

Ten days later the cardinals went into conclave at Naples, and elected Cardinal Benedict Cajetan,[1] who took the name of Boniface VIII. He belonged to the same noble family that had already given to the Church three illustrious Pontiffs, viz., Innocent III., Gregory IX., and Alexander IV.,; and was held in high repute for his learning, especially for his profound knowledge of canon and civil law.[2] Immediately after his election he set out for Rome, where the ceremony of his coronation[3] was performed on the 23rd January, 1295, with unprecedented magnificence, the Kings of Naples and Hungary having held the reins of his horse on the occasion. Election of Boniface VIII.

---

[1] It was asserted by some of his enemies that he secured his election by unfair intriguing with Charles of Naples. Against this we have the authority of Cardinal James of Stephaneschi, who says that the King of Naples was quite disappointed at the result of the election. His words are:—

"Caroli spes coepta precando,
Deficit, miserante Deo. Sunt ista relatu
Digna, quod et patri nec non sibi praestita noscens
Munera ab Ecclesia, vultus avertit et ora."

De Electione Bonifacii, lib. i., 52-55 : *Acta Sanct.*, xv. 462.

[2] He enriched canon law by a collection of decretals (*Sextus Decretalium*).

[3] The second crown is said to have been added to the Papal Tiara by Boniface, to typify the temporal power of the Popes; while the third crown was added, according to many writers, about half a century later by Urban V.

Imprisonment and death of Celestine V. (1296).

Before leaving Naples, Boniface VIII. gave orders to have the late Pope taken to Rome, lest his simplicity might be taken advantage of by some wicked men[1] to create a schism in the Church. On his way thither Peter escaped, and fled to his old retreat near Sulmona. He was shortly afterwards arrested; but succeeded in making his escape a second time, and made his way to a port in Southern Italy, from which he was about to sail for the East, when he was recaptured. After consulting with the cardinals, Boniface sent him to the castle of Fumone, where he was kept in honourable captivity till his death in 1296.[2]

Boniface charged with undue severity towards Celestine.

A cell was constructed for the ex-Pope in the castle of Fumone similar to that in which he had lived at Murrone. This is the only foundation for the charge of cruelty circulated by the enemies[3] of Boniface, viz., that he had

---

[1] Peter D'Ailly. in his *Life of Celestine*, says (lib. ii., c. 16): "Erant tunc multi qui viro Dei saudebant, ut se Papam faceret nominari dicentes eum de jure non potuisse renuntiare Papatui." *Acta Sanct.*, xv. 495.

[2] According to some writers he lived till 1302. (See *Acta Sanct.*, xv. 420.)

[3] Some went even so far as to say that Boniface put his prisoner to death by having a nail driven through his head. Muratori, writing on the charge in his *Annals*, merely remarks (Ad an. 1297) that the mere clumsiness of the charge is a sufficient refutation of it: for, as he says, it would have been much easier to get rid of him by poison. We are told by Peter D'Ailly, *Life of Celestine*, ii., c. 18, that, after celebrating on Pentecost Sunday, he announced to the guards of the castle that he would die before the end of the week. And Cardinal James of Stephaneschi, who had the amplest opportunity of knowing what occurred, being, as he assures us in the preface to his Life, his constant companion, "praesens, videns, ministrans palpans et audiens," says that he died of fever.

" . : . Siccis humoribus ardens,
Febris adest stimulatque senem sacrisque potitum,
Exhalare cogit piam ad sidera mentem."

De Canoniz. S. Petri, lib. i., 112-4; *Acta Sanct.*, xv. 474.

Peter confined in a narrow, miserable room, unfit for human habitation, and thus brought him to a premature end. Against this charge it is sufficient to refer to a similar cell constructed by Peter himself in his palace at Naples, and to appeal to the testimony of contemporary writers,[1] who assert that he was kept in honourable confinement; as well as to Peter D'Ailly († 1425), who, though by no means friendly disposed towards Boniface,[2] says that the cell was constructed at the special request of Peter, and that two of his religious were allowed free access to him.

His attempt to settle the affairs of Sicily.

The first serious difficulty in which Boniface was involved arose out of his efforts to settle the affairs of Sicily, which had been in a very distracted condition since the time of the Sicilian Vespers. The island was claimed by two rivals, viz., Charles II. of Naples, in right of his father, Charles of Anjou († 1285), on whom it had been bestowed by Clement IV., and James II. of Aragon, the brother and successor of Peter III. († 1285), who had conquered it from the French. Peter, as well as his successor, had incurred the sentence of excommunication, for daring to usurp a fief of the Holy See; and their

Claims of Charles II. of Naples and James II. of Aragon.

---

[1] Ptolemy of Lucca († 1321) writes thus in his *Ecclesiastical History* (xxiv., c. 29): "Tentus igitur in custodia, non quidem libera honesta tamen in castro ut dicunt Fumonis moritur." (*Acta Sanct.*, xv. 428.) And William of Lange, another contemporary, says (*Annales*, Ad an. 1294): "Hic (Bonifacius) Caelestinum Papam depositum, volentem ad locum unde fuerat assumptus redire, minime permissit, sed *honorifice* fecit cum diligenti custodia in loco tutissimo custodiri."—*Acta Sanct., ibidem.*

[2] "Cellam optanti, in castro Fumonis firmo cellam qualem verosimiliter sanctus ipsi designaverat, ad formam ejus quam in Murrone habuerat fieri jussit."—*Vita Caelestini*, L. ii., c. 16. And James Stephaneschi states (*Vita Caelestini, De Canoniz.*, L. i., 95-105) that he refused to avail himself of the other parts of the castle that were placed at his disposal.

Agreement effected between them by Boniface.

kingdom, which was held as a fief of the Papacy, was transferred to Charles of Valois, son of Philip III. († 1285) of France. Boniface endeavoured to reconcile the conflicting claims of Charles and James by offering to restore the latter to peace with the Church, to confirm him in possession of Aragon, and to grant him the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, which were fiefs of the Holy See, on condition that he should cede Sicily to Charles of Naples. The offer being accepted, James of Aragon was absolved from the censures he had incurred, and was invested by Boniface with his Spanish possessions.

James's brother usurps the Sicilian crown (1296).

Peace was not, however, restored to Sicily by this agreement between the Pope and James of Aragon. The inhabitants of that island, unwilling to submit to the yoke of the French, of which they had had already sufficient experience, offered the crown to Frederick, James's brother. The latter accepted the offer, against the protests of Boniface, and was crowned King of Sicily, at Palermo, on Easter Sunday, 1296. Sentence of excommunication was immediately pronounced against him; but the censure appears to have been unheeded by him. A war ensued between him and Charles II., who was assisted by Boniface VIII. It continued till 1303, when it was terminated by a treaty, according to which Frederick was to be absolved from the censures he had incurred, to marry the daughter of his rival, and to receive Sicily as dowry, to be held during his lifetime, after which it was to revert to the King of Naples.[1]

Peace restored to Sicily (1303).

Boniface's quarrel with the Colonnas.

Boniface engaged in another dispute which affected him more immediately than the last, viz., that with two

[1] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1303, n. xxv.

members of the Sacred College, James Colonna and his nephew Peter Colonna. They belonged to a powerful Italian family that had numerous fortresses in the vicinity of Rome. An estrangement took place between them and Boniface shortly after his elevation to the Papacy, owing chiefly to the following causes :—(*a*) James Colonna violated the rights of his brothers Matthew, Otho, and Landulph, by appropriating their property. They appealed to the Pope, who decided in their favour; but the cardinal obstinately refused to abide by his decision. (*b*) James Colonna was well known to have been on friendly terms with the Spanish usurpers of Sicily, whom he urged to maintain their sovereignty over that island. And (*c*) it was alleged that he had actually entered into negotiations with Frederick to invade Southern Italy, and had secured the co-operation of Cardinal Peter and most of the members of his powerful family.

Causes that led to it.

To test the loyalty of the cardinals, Boniface asked them, in accordance with the custom of the age, to deliver up their castles. With this demand they refused to comply and fled from Rome, on the 14th of May, 1297. Six days later they issued a manifesto containing numerous charges against Boniface, and declaring his election invalid. On the same day the Pope issued a Bull depriving the rebellious cardinals of their dignities, and pronouncing sentence of excommunication against them. War was declared against the rebellious members of the Colonna family. Their fortresses were taken without much difficulty, with the exception of Palestrina, the best of their strongholds, which held out for a time against the Papal troops. Its defenders, however, soon finding that further resistance was useless, surrendered, in September, 1298, and sought

Refusal of James and Peter Colonna to surrender their castles.

War declared against them.

Surrender of Palestrina.

forgiveness from Boniface. Their petition was favourably heard; but the stronghold was razed to the ground, and a new Papal city built in its vicinity. The Colonnas shortly afterwards organized another rebellion, which led to the confiscation of their property and the withdrawal of the leading members of the family to France and other countries, where they circulated the numerous defamatory reports against Boniface handed down in the writings of his enemies.

Boniface charged with violating his promise to the Colonnas.

Among those calumnies is one connected with the siege of Palestrina, which is thus described by an Anglican writer:[1] "As its [viz., Palestrina's] strength seemed likely to defy all assault, the Pope summoned to his council Count Guy, of Montefeltro, who, after a life of warfare as a Ghibelline commander, during which he had often incurred and defied the heaviest censures of the Church, had lately made his peace with it, and had withdrawn into a Franciscan cloister at Ancona. The old warrior, after having surveyed the walls of Palestrina, declared that he could not suggest any means of taking it save by the commission of a grave sin. The Pope eagerly promised absolution for any sin that he might commit by giving his advice; whereupon Guy told him to 'promise much, but perform little.' Boniface, it is said, acted without scruple on this hint. The Colonnas were deluded by a promise that mercy should be shown to them if they would submit."

The charge refuted.

This, one of the many calumnies against Boniface contained in Dante's *Divina Commedia*, has been proved by Tosti in his learned work, *Storia di Bonifazio VIII.*,[2] and

[1] Rob., vi. 310.

[2] Vol. ii. Appendix B.

many other writers,[1] to be devoid of any foundation :— (*a*) The ardent Ghibelline Dante (†1321), who was so bitterly opposed to Boniface, is the only contemporary writer who mentions it. (*b*) Cardinal Francis Cajetan proved, before the commission appointed by Clement V. to inquire into the charges against Boniface, that there had been no compact whatever entered into on the occasion of the surrender of Palestrina, which submitted unconditionally to the mercy of the Pope.[2] And (*c*) Guy of Montefeltro was a feeble old man at the time that Palestrina was besieged, and died on the 23rd or 29th[3] of September, 1298, the very month in which Palestrina surrendered. It is not therefore at all likely that he could have been asked by the Pope to inspect the fortress.

His quarrel with Philip of France

But the quarrel which gave Boniface most trouble and annoyance was that in which he engaged with Philip the Fair of France (1285-1314), in the defence of the Church's rights and liberties. The latter, who is described as "a man singularly hard, cold, unscrupulous, and selfish, and thoroughly imbued with the principles of the civil lawyers as to the absolute rights of sovereignty,"[4] was carrying on a war against Edward I. of England (1272-1307) to wrest from him his French possessions. Both kings imposed heavy taxes on ecclesiastical property to raise the necessary expenses. The clergy of England and France appealed to the Pope to interfere as the head of Christendom, and put an end to a contest that was impoverishing

[1] *v.g.*, Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, Ad an. 1298; Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, Ad an. 1299; Wiseman, *Essays on Various Subjects*, vol. iii., 204-17.

[2] Palma, *Prael. in Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 405.

[3] From the inscription on his tomb it is uncertain whether he died on the 23rd or 29th of September.

[4] Rob., vi. 315.

Heavy taxes imposed on the clergy of France and England.

the Churches of both countries. That there was sufficient reason for their appeal will appear when we remember that Edward I. required the clergy of his dominions to pay one-half of their annual income; while the clergy of France were obliged to contribute one-fifth of their movable and immovable property.

The Pope interferes by issuing the Bull *Clericis Laicos* (1296).

Yielding to the entreaties of the clergy of France and England, Boniface sought to bring about a cessation of hostilities between Philip and Edward. Having failed, however, in his efforts. he issued a Bull *Clericis Laicos*,[1] in 1296, complaining of the excessive taxes imposed on Church property for secular purposes, and pronouncing sentence of excommunication against all laymen who should exact such taxes, as well as against ecclesiastics who should pay them. This was merely a renewel of a law[2] already in existence, except that the censure was now extended to the clergy.

Philip whose animus against the Church had been already sufficiently shown by an edict issued early in his

---

[1] This Bull was modified by Benedict XI., Boniface's successor, in accordance with the 46th canon of the fourth General Council of Lateran.

[2] The collection of exorbitant taxes had been forbidden by the third General Council of Lateran, canon 19; fourth General Council of Lateran, canons 44 and 46; and by a decree of Alexander IV., in 1260. The 46th canon of the fourth General Council of Lateran runs as follows:—"Adversus consules ac rectores civitatum et alios qui ecclesias et viros ecclesiasticos taliis seu collectis et exacti onibus aliis aggravare nituntur. Volens immunitati ecclesiasticae Lateranense concilium providere, praesumptionem hujusmodi sub anathematis districtione prohibuit, transgressores et fautores eorum praecipiens excommunicationi subjacere donec satisfactionem impendant competentem." Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 51.

If ecclesiastics considered that there was a reasonable necessity for demanding exceptional taxes for secular purposes, they were allowed to pay them with the permission of the Pope.

reign excluding ecclesiastics from all share in the administration of the laws of the country, took occasion from the Bull of Boniface to still further restrict her rights. Pretending to understand that the Bull contained new legislation, and that it was directed as a personal attack against himself, he issued a decree forbidding the exportation of gold and other valuables from the kingdom. This was intended to deprive the Pope and other ecclesiastics not residing in France of their means of income from that country. When Boniface heard of the construction put on the Bull *Clericis Laicos*, he published the Bull *Ineffabilis* (September, 1296), explaining the previous one, and showing that its purpose was merely to enforce the already existing laws of the Church. And to prove his readiness to assist the King of France in every reasonable way, he issued a brief in the following year (1297), allowing him the tithes of the French Church for three years. Thus ended the difficulty between Boniface and Philip for the present.

The exportation of Gold, &c., from France forbidden.

The Bull *Ineffabilis*.

Boniface continued his efforts to terminate the war between France and England, which was exhausting the resources of the two countries. He at length succeeded, in 1298, in prevailing on Philip and Edward to agree to a truce for a year, and to appoint him as arbiter of the dispute between them; not in his official capacity as Pope, but simply as Benedict Cajetan. After examining the claims of the two kings, he decided that things should remain as they had been at the commencement of the war. When the decision[1] was announced to Philip by a

The kings of France and England agree to a truce (1298).

[1] The Pope's decision is declared "very equitable" by Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. 229.

Papal legate, the paper on which it was written was snatched from his hands by the Count of Artois, who cast it into the fire, declaring that France would never submit to such terms. War was renewed between the two countries, on the expiration of the truce, in 1299.

Renewal of the war (1299).

Philip, who had determined to maintain what he proclaimed his rights against the Church, foresaw that a renewal of the quarrel between himself and Boniface was inevitable. He sought, therefore, to strengthen his hands for the coming struggle by forming an alliance with Albert of Austria,[1] emperor-elect, and with the exiled members of the Colonna family, especially with James, called Sciarra Colonna, "who carried to an extreme the rude lawlessness for which his race was noted,"[2] and supplied the King with various defamatory charges against Boniface.

Philip prepares for a renewal of the struggle with the Pope.

Under the name of *royalties* (*regalia*) he began to urge the most extravagant claims to authority over ecclesiastics and their property. He deposed bishops who were known to be favourable to the Holy See, appropriated the revenues of vacant sees, as well as the money collected for a Crusade, and conferred numerous benefices on his own favourites.

Philip's claims over ecclesiastical property.

---

[1] He had been elected King of Germany, in 1298, in opposition to Adolph of Nassau (1292-98), who was declared deposed by the electors on account of his numerous misdeeds. A war ensued, which was soon terminated by the death of Adolph a week after his deposition at the Battle of Gellheim. Boniface refused at first to acknowledge his claim to the throne, as he failed to comply with what usage required in the case of disputed elections by not referring the question to the Holy See. But the struggle in which he was engaged with Philip of France rendered it impossible for him to offer effective resistance to Albert's claims. The latter was reconciled with the Pope, in 1303, and invited to Rome to receive the imperial crown. He was the second member of the house of Hapsburg who was emperor, Rudolph (1273-91) being the first.

[2] Rob., vi. 325.

When Boniface heard of the King's conduct he sent Bernard, bishop of the newly-created see of Pamiers, as Papal legate to the French Court, in 1301, to protest against the royal pretensions, and to secure the release of the Count of Flanders, who had been imprisoned by Philip, together with his wife and daughter. While Bernard is generally painted by French historians as the type of imperious arrogance, and quite unsuited for the delicate mission on which he was sent, he is described by Italian and other writers[1] as a prudent, learned, and energetic ecclesiastic. Having explained his mission to the King, he was abruptly dismissed from the royal presence; and, being shortly afterwards arrested, was arraigned before the supreme council of the nation at Senlis, on various charges, such as speaking disparagingly of the King and the French people, entering into treasonable correspondence with the King of England, and instigating some of Philip's subjects to revolt. The prosecution, described[2] by Guizot, as "a pattern of iniquity and violence," was conducted by Peter Flotte, the King's Chancellor, and William of Nogaret, the ablest of his counsellors. The trial ended, as we should expect, in the accused being declared guilty, and condemned to imprisonment.

Legate sent to protest against Philip's conduct.

Prosecution of the legate.

On hearing of the treatment to which his legate had been subjected, Boniface naturally felt indignant, and, resolved to defend the rights of the Church against Philip's tyranny. He issued a Bull on the 4th December, 1301, suspending all privileges bestowed on the kings of France by his predecessors, and calling on Philip to release the

Boniface suspends privileges granted to kings of France, and convokes a council.

[1] See Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 39.

[2] *Lectures on the History of Civilization* (Eng. ed.), iii. 281.

legate. Two days later he forwarded letters to the bishops of France summoning them to a council to be held at Rome towards the end of the following year; and issued the Bull *Ausculta Fili*, reminding Philip that he, as every other Christian, was subject to the Holy See, and warning him to desist from his course of hostility to the Church.

The Bull *Auscuta Fili.*

When the Bull was read to the King, on the 10th of February, 1302, by the Archdeacon of Narbonne, it was immediately seized by one of the nobles present and burned. A document purporting to be a copy of the Bull was drawn up by order of the King, in which the Pope's views were completely misrepresented. It was circulated among the people, accompanied by a reply[1] in the King's name, "of coarse, and even vulgar insolence,"[2] supposed to have been written by Flotte.

As soon as Philip believed that the feelings of the people had been sufficiently aroused against the Pope by misrepresentation, he held a national assembly in Paris, on the 10th of April, 1302. Peter Flotte, who was the leading spirit of the opposition against the Papacy, addressed the assembly at considerable length, dwelling chiefly on those points that were most likely to enlist the sympathy of the clergy as well as of the laity in favour of the King.

National assembly held at Paris (1302).

---

[1] It is thus given by Dupuy (*Boniface VIII. et Philippe le Bel*, page 44): "Philippus Dei gratia Francorum rex Bonifatio se gerenti pro Summo Pontifice salutem modicam seu nullam. Sciat *maxima tua fatuitas* in temporalibus nos alicui non subesse, ecclesiarum et praebendarum vacantium collationes ad nos jure regio pertinere, fructus earum nostros facere, collationes a nobis hactenus factas et in posterum faciendas fore validas in praeteritum et futurum, et eorum possessores contra omnes viriliter nos tueri. Secus autem credentes fatuos et dementes reputamus."

[2] Rob., vi. 338.

He described how Rome had arbitrarily disposed of the best benefices of the country to strangers, had constantly interfered with bishops in the discharge of their duties, and had imposed heavy taxes on ecclesiastics; and concluded by asking those present would they allow France to be reduced to the condition of a fief to the Holy See, as stated in the Bull *Ausculta Fili.* The laity answered at once by declaring their intention to stand by the King against the Pope. The clergy asked for time to deliberate, but their request was refused, and they were terrified into submission. The bishops were also refused permission to attend the Roman council to which they had been summoned.

Boniface repudiates the views attributed to him.

When Boniface learned what had occurred at Paris, he held a public consistory, in which he disowned the false views attributed to him at the French assembly, denying that he had ever claimed the right of suzerainty over France.

Council held at Rome (1302).

The Roman council to which the French bishops had been summoned was held in November, 1302. Notwithstanding Philip's prohibition, four archbishops, thirty-five bishops, and six abbots attended from his kingdom. The fathers directed their attention chiefly to considering the great question that occupied the public mind at the time, viz., the relations between the Church and State. Their

---

1 "Quadraginta anni sunt," says Boniface, "quod nos sumus experti in jure et scimus quod duae sunt potestates ordinatae a Deo; quis ergo debet credere vel potest, quod tanta *fatuitas*, tanta insipientia sit vel fuerit in capite nostro? Dicimus quod in nullo volumus usurpare jurisdictionem regis. Sed non potest ignorare rex seu quicumque alter fidelis quin sit nobis subjectus ratione peccati." (Dupuy, page 77.)

opinions were expressed in the Bull *Unam Sanctam* published by Boniface VIII., on the 18th November. The teaching of this famous Bull may be briefly set forth under the following heads:—(*a*) There is but one Church, outside which there is no salvation. (*b*) Its invisible head is Christ, and its visible head the successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome. (*c*) There is a twofold power in the Church, viz., the spiritual and the temporal, the one belonging to the priesthood, and the other to the State, to be exercised for the good of the Church.[1] (*d*) The spiritual power is superior to the temporal, and directs it in the ways of truth and justice. And (*e*), it is of faith that all men are subject to the Pope.[2]

The Bull *Unam Sanctam*.

Philip, whose indignation had been aroused by the attendance of so many French bishops at the Roman council, confiscated their property; and by his general conduct, manifested a stronger determination than ever to continue his policy of opposition to the Church. Boniface finding that all his efforts to bring about a reconciliation with Philip were fruitless, pronounced sentence of excommunication against him on the 13th of April, 1303.

Confiscation of Church property by Philip.

The King of France retaliated by convening an assembly of the Three Estates of the Realm at Paris, in June, 1303, to inquire into the charges against Boniface, and to

An Assembly of the French Estates held (1303).

---

[1] "Uterque ergo est in potestate Ecclesiae, spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis; sed is quidem pro ecclesia, ille vero ab ecclesia exercendus; ille sacerdotis, is manu regum et militum sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis."

[2] "Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni creaturae humanae declaramus dicimus et definimus omnino esse de necessitate salutis." See Raynaldus, Ad an. 1302.

consider what measures should be adopted to bring about his deposition. The charges were brought forward under twenty-nine heads. Boniface was accused of murder, heresy, idolatry, immorality, and simony. The proofs adduced to substantiate these charges were generally of a most ludicrous kind. He was, for instance, charged with heresy, because he had compared a Frenchman to a dog, thereby denying the immortality of the soul; and of idolatry, because he had his image engraven on some presents which he had made to churches. The minds of those present were, however, so much influenced by the system of wholesale misrepresentation and intimidation practised, that both clergy and laity appealed against Boniface to a future general council and a future lawful Pope; the only one who had the courage to protest against the proceedings being the abbot of Citeaux.

Boniface resolves to depose Philip.

Boniface, on hearing of the action of the French assembly, held a consistory at Anagni, where he was staying at the time. He denied on oath the truth of the charges alleged against him, and announced his intention of issuing a Bull of deposition against Philip. The Bull was actually executed, and was to be published on the following 8th of September.

The Pope attacked at Anagni.

On the day preceding the date fixed for the publication of the Bull an armed band, organized at the King's expense, by William of Nogaret, Flotte's successor, and Sciarra Colonna, appeared at Anagni ; and, having secured an entrance into the town, rushed to the Papal palace, crying, "Death to Boniface: Long live the King of France." Having hastily put on his pontifical robes, "the dauntless Boniface, unarmed and alone, seated himself on his chair, and awaited, like the Conscript

Fathers of old, the swords of the Gauls."[1] On the arrival of the latter in the presence of the Pope, Sciarra Colonna haughtily addressed him, and commanded him to resign a position to which he had no other claim than that of usurpation. To this Boniface calmly replied: "Behold my neck and my head. If I have been betrayed, like Christ, I am ready to die like Christ's Vicar." He was immediately arrested and cast into prison. During his confinement he was subjected to every form of indignity that the wickedness of his jailers could suggest. At the end of three days, however, the people of Anagni, assisted by some soldiers from the neighbouring towns, attacked the Pope's captors, and compelled them to restore him to freedom. He immediately returned to Rome, where he died shortly afterwards, on the 11th October, from the effects of his recent captivity.

His imprisonment and death (1303).

A report was circulated by the enemies of Boniface, that immediately before his death he was seized with a fit of remorse, rage, and excitement, during which he tore the flesh from his face.[2] The falsehood of this story can be easily shown from contemporary writers; and has been placed beyond all doubt since the year 1605, when, on the restoration of the sacristy of St. Peter's, where he was buried, his body was exposed and found to be perfectly intact, and free from the slighest indication of violence.[3]

Charge against Boniface of tearing the flesh from his face.

One of the most notable events of his pontificate was the celebration of the Centennial Jubilee, in the year 1300. Towards the end of 1299 it was currently reported that it

The Centennial Jubilee.

[1] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv. 403.

[2] John Villani, viii. 63.

[3] Raynaldus, An an. 1303.

had been usual to observe the last year of each century as one of special devotion. The report having been confirmed by some very old men who declared that, to their personal knowledge, the year 1200 had been so observed,[1] Boniface issued a Bull on the 22nd February, 1300, granting a plenary indulgence to all who should visit the tombs of the Apostles with proper dispositions in the course of the year—strangers on fifteen successive days, and residents on thirty; and concluded by making the Centennial Jubilee a permanent institution in the Church. Immense crowds thronged to Rome in the course of the year to obtain the spiritual privileges offered to them by the Pope. We are told[2] by John Villani († 1348), who was himself present on the occasion, that there were usually 200,000 strangers in the city.

The interval between Jubilees shortened.

The Jubilee was found to be so fruitful in good results, that the interval between two Jubilees was reduced by Clement VI. (1342-52) to fifty years. It was still further reduced by Urban VI. (1378-89) to thirty-three years; and finally by Paul II. (1464-71) to its present number twenty-five years.

Dante's enmity towards Boniface.

The calumnies circulated by Boniface's numerous enemies appear to have been believed by Dante, who speaks of him as the "Prince of modern Pharisees,"[3] a "simoniac,"[4] and "a usurper."[5] In order, however, to form a fair estimate of the value to be attached to the

---

[1] It is therefore doubtful whether the Jubilee of Boniface VIII. was the first Christian celebration of the kind.

[2] *Hist. Flor.*, viii. 36.

[3] *Inferno*, xxvii. 85.

[4] *Inferno*, xix. 52.

[5] *Paradiso*, xxvii. 22.

statements of the great Italian poet, it will be necessary for us to bear in mind the relations that existed between himself and Boniface.

Reason of this enmity.

Dante belonged to the Ghibelline faction in Florence known as the Bianchi, by whom the leaders of the Guelfs or Neri were expelled from the city. The latter hastened to Rome and laid their complaints before Boniface. The Pope invited Charles of Valois, brother of the King of France, to Italy, to restore order in Florence. In compliance with the Pope's invitation, Charles went to Florence; but, instead of acting as an angel of peace, he conducted himself as a tyrant banishing many of the Bianchi, among whom was Dante. The poet spent the remainder of his life in exile in different cities brooding over his misfortunes, which he attributed to Boniface. This will sufficiently explain the deadly enmity entertained by him towards Boniface, and his readiness to accept reports injurious to the Pope's character.

Commission appointed to inquire into charges against Boniface (1307).

At the urgent request of Philip and many of the French nobles, Clement V. (1305-14) instituted an inquiry, in 1307, into the charges[1] alleged against Boniface. The prosecution was conducted by William of Nogaret, the King's Chancellor, and William of Plasian, another eminent French lawyer. They collected witnesses from different parts of France and Italy to prove the charges against Boniface. Many also presented themselves voluntarily before the commission to defend his character. After the inquiry had continued for four years, Philip withdrew from

---

[1] For full inquiry into the charges against Boniface, see Card. Wiseman, *Essays on Various Subjects*, vol. iii., 159-222; Palma, *Prael. in Hist. Eccles.*, vol. ii., 371-405; Jungmann, *Diss. in Hist. Eccles.*, vol. vi., 1-76.

the prosecution on his being declared to have acted *bona fide;*[1] and the commission immediately terminated its labours (1311) without pronouncing any decision.[2]

Boniface's general character.

The more thoroughly Boniface's character is studied in the light of his age, and of the peculiar difficulties that beset him throughout his pontificate, the more will the severity with which some writers speak of him appear to be unjustifiable. He is styled by Petrarch the "marvel of the world." And Cardinal Wiseman writes of him as "a Pontiff who began his reign with most glorious promise, and closed it amidst sad calamities; who devoted, through it, all the energies of a great mind, cultivated by profound learning, and matured by long experience in the most delicate ecclesiastical affairs, to the attainment of a truly noble end; and who throughout his career, displayed many great virtues, and could plead in extenuation of his faults the convulsed state of public affairs, the rudeness of his times, the faithless, violent character of many of those with whom he had to deal."

---

[1] We can easily conceive how Philip could have been *bona fide*, considering the extent to which defamatory reports were circulated against Boniface in France, and that many of these reports were supported by two exiled members of the Sacred College.

[2] According to St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence († 1459), the Council of Vienne (1311-12) declared Boniface lawful Pope, and free from the charge of heresy. Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 1343.

CHAPTER XV.

THE AVIGNON POPES.

So-called Babylonian Captivity of the Papacy.

THE residence of the Popes at Avignon has[1] been generally described by Italian historians as the Babylonian Captivity of the Papacy, because of their alleged subjection to French influence. The accuracy of the description is repudiated by French writers, who maintain that the Popes who lived in France, if not freer, were at least as free from external interference as their predecessors had been in Italy.

Predecessors of the Avignon Popes often driven into exile.

In passing judgment on the continued absence of the Avignon Popes for about seventy years from their see, we must bear in mind that many of their predecessors had been badly treated by the fickle Italians and had been frequently forced to go into exile. Hence,[2] if the French Popes considered that they could not with safety to themselves reside at Rome, it was but natural that they should have turned to their own country for a place of refuge and security.

---

[1] Avignon is a town in Southern France, on the left bank of the Rhone. At the time of which we are treating it was the capital of the county of Venaissin, and belonged to the King of Naples, who was vassal of the Holy See

[2] Gayet has shown in his recently published work, *Le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, that between 1100 and 1304, the Popes were in intermittent exile for about one hundred and twenty-two years, *i.e.*, forty years longer than their residence in Rome.

Clement V. (1305-14).

On the death of Benedict XI., the successor of Boniface VIII. (June 27, 1304), fifteen cardinals[1] went into conclave at Perugia. They were divided into two sections, one advocating the election of a Pope who would continue the Policy of Boniface VIII.; while the rival party, consisting of the French and Neapolitan cardinals, wished to choose one who would be favourable to Philip the Fair. They clung obstinately to their respective candidates; and it was not till the Holy See had remained vacant for over eleven months that the required majority of votes was secured (June 5, 1305) in favour of Bertrand of Got, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who took the name of Clement V. (1305-14).

His election.

Clement's election has given rise to much controversy. According to Villani[2]—who writes in a very hostile spirit of everything French—it was the result of intrigue between him and Philip the Fair. The Florentine historian says, that after the cardinals had been nine months in conclave it was agreed that the Italians were to name three candidates of French Nationality, of whom one should be selected by the opposite party and unanimously declared Pope. Three names were accordingly selected by the Italians, one being that of the Archbishop of Bordeaux. Messengers were immediately despatched to Philip to acquaint him of the result. The King, on hearing it, is alleged to have had an interview with Bertrand at the Abbey of St. Jean d'Angely, and to have undertaken to secure the Archbishop's election if he would promise—(*a*) to reconcile Philip with the Church; (*b*) to absolve his

Alleged compact between Clement and Philip the Fair.

[1] There were four absent.

[2] viii., c. 8.

followers from all censures; (*c*) to grant him the tithes of the French Church for five years; (*d*) to erase the name of Boniface from the list of Popes; (*e*) to restore James and Peter Colonna to their former dignities. There was a sixth article[1] of agreement; but it was to be kept secret till the opportune time arrived for making it public. Bertrand, having undertaken to comply with the required conditions, was recommended by Philip to the French cardinals, and unanimously elected.

Reasons for rejecting the story of the compact.

Various reasons are urged by modern writers to show that Villani's account of the alleged compact is devoid of foundation. (*a*) Villani is the only contemporary writer who mentions it. (*b*) The Italian cardinals, when summoned against their will across the Alps, to attend at Clement's coronation, do not refer to it in their letter of protestation written in reply. (*c*) When Clement refused to erase Boniface's name from the list of Popes, Philip did not appeal to any previous agreement between them in support of his request. (*d*) The acts of the conclave, which are extant, show that Clement was elected by scrutiny, and not by compromise, as stated by Villani, for he received only ten votes, which gave him merely the required majority. (*e*) The Diaries of Clement and Philip show conclusively that the alleged meeting between them could not have taken place. For, according to Villani, it should have taken place in the month of May, as it had been agreed among the cardinals that the election should be concluded within forty days after the three names had been submitted by the Italians. During every day of

[1] According to some of those who defend the authenticity of the agreement, the sixth article referred to the suppression of the Templars.

that month Philip was in Paris, and the other was on visitation through his diocese. Hence they could not have met at St. Jean d'Angely, which was about seventy miles distant from Bordeaux, and about three hundred from Paris.

How the story probably originated.

We can easily conceive how Clement's refusal to leave France should have given rise to false rumours regarding the motives of his action among those who were interested in having the Papal Court in Italy. The idea of a compromise was probably suggested by the fact that Bertrand was immediately subject to the King of England, and would, therefore, be considered less objectionable to the Italian Cardinals; while the terms of the alleged agreement were most likely concocted in the light of Clement's subsequent dealings with Philip and his followers.

His coronation at Lyons.

Clement had the ceremony of his coronation performed at Lyons, on the 14th of November, 1305. During the procession, an old wall on which a large number had assembled gave way, throwing the Pope off his horse and killing twelve persons, among whom were the Pope's own brother, and the Duke of Brittany, who was leading his horse. The accident was generally regarded at the time as one of evil omen.

After his coronation he resided at Lyons, Bordeaux, and other parts of France, till 1309, when he finally settled down at Avignon.

His readiness to comply with Philip's wishes.

Clement has been censured by many writers for having been too subservient to French influence. For instance, he restored Philip and his followers to communion with the Church; he confirmed the action of his predecessor in recalling the Bull *Clericis Laicos*, in so far as it had added to previous legislation on the taxation of

ecclesiastics: while refusing to retract the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, he declared [1] that it was not intended to prejudice the rights of Philip or his kingdom: he granted Philip the tithes of the French Church for five years: he restored the Colonnas to their former dignities: and, finally, he raised fifteen Frenchmen to the Cardinalate.

He asserts his independence when required

Clement, who was of a pacific disposition, while generally ready to accede to the King's requests as far as he considered he could do so without sin, was equally ready to assert his independence when he felt that principle required it. Thus he refused to condemn the memory of Boniface VIII.: he refused to recall the Bull *Unam Sanctam:* and, on the death of Albert I.[2] of Germany, in 1308, he opposed the claims of Philip's brother, Charles of Valois, to the vacant throne, and supported the Count of Luxemburg, who was accordingly elected emperor under the name of Henry VII. (1308-13).

The most memorable events of his pontificate were the celebration of the General Council of Vienne and the suppression of the Knights Templars. Of these we shall treat in the next chapter.

On the death of Clement V., in 1314, the Holy See

---

[1] "Nos regi," he writes, "et regno per definitionem et declarationem bonae memoriae Bonifacii praedecessoris nostri *Unam Sanctam*, nullum volumus vel intendimus praejudicium generari; nec quod per illam rex, regnum, et regnicolae praelibati amplius Ecclesiae sint subjecti Romanae, quam antea existebant; sed omnia intelligantur in eodem esse statu, quo erant ante definitionem praefatam, tam quantum ad ecclesiam quam etiam ad regem, regnum, et regnicolas superius nominatos." The letter from which this extract is taken has been inserted in the collections of canon law (*Extrav. Comm.*) under the name of the decretal *Meruit*.

[2] Albert was on his way to suppress a revolt among the Swiss when he died. With this revolt is commonly associated the name of William Tell, about whose existence there has been so much controversy in recent times.

remained vacant for two years owing to divisions among the cardinals.[1] They were split up into three sections viz., the Italians, who wished to elect one of their own nationality; the Gascons who had been specially favoured by the late Pope, and sought to have one of their own party appointed; and the remaining French cardinals, who appeared to be as much opposed to the Gascons as to the Italians. They were at length prevailed on by Philip of Poitiers, the King's brother, to enter into conclave at Lyons; and they elected (August 7, 1316) James of Cahors, formerly Bishop of Avignon, but at the time Cardinal Bishop of Porto. The newly-elected Pope, who was favourably known for his eloquence, learning, and blameless life, took the name of John XXII.

Vacancy of the Holy See (1314-16).

John XXII. (1316-34).

John was engaged throughout his pontificate (1316-34) in a quarrel with Louis of Bavaria regarding the claims of the latter to the German throne. On the death of Henry VII., in 1313, the electors could not agree in the choice of a successor. Three of them gave their votes, on the 19th October, 1314, to Frederick of Austria, the son of Henry's predecessor; and, on the following day, the remaining four elected Frederick's cousin, Louis of Bavaria. Two votes of the latter and one of the former were objected to as invalid; and, therefore, the two candidates appeared to have equal claims to the crown.

His quarrel with Louis of Bavaria.

According to the usage of the age, the dispute should have been referred to the decision of the Holy See. But as there was no Pope at the time, the followers of the two princes had recourse to arms to maintain their claims. A civil war ensued, which continued to devastate Germany till 1322,

Its cause.

[1] There were twenty-three cardinals in the Sacred College at the time, of whom fifteen were French.

when Frederick was defeated and taken prisoner by his victorious rival. Louis immediately claimed the German Crown by right of conquest, without any reference to the Holy See, and assumed the administration of affairs in Italy which belonged by custom to the Popes during the vacancy of the empire.

Louis refuses to appear at Avignon.

Louis was summoned by John, in 1323, to appear at Avignon under the penalty of excommunication within three months, to defend his claims to the German Crown, and to answer for his conduct in regard to Italy. Louis replied by denying the Pope's right to interfere in German elections; accused him of heresy and made various other charges, supplied no doubt, by the schismatical Franciscans who had taken the King's side; and concluded by appealing against him to the decision of a General Council. Finding that his citation had been treated with contempt, John pronounced sentence of excommunication against Louis on the 23rd March, 1324, and about three months later absolved his subjects from their oaths of allegiance.

His excommunication and deposition (1324).

Louis maintained his claims in open defiance of the Pope and his ecclesiastical censures. He crossed the Alps, in 1327, and was crowned with the Iron Crown of Lombardy in Milan by two deposed bishops. On the 17th of the following January he received the imperial crown at Rome from the hands of Sciarra Colonna, recently elected chief magistrate by the Romans. Carried away by the apparent triumph of his cause, he dared to sit in judgment on the Vicar of Christ, against whom he brought various charges. John was declared guilty by the imperial tribunal, and the sentence of deposition pronounced against him in St. Peter's, on the 18th of April. The see

Louis crowned emperor at Rome (1328).

thus declared vacant was filled about three weeks later by a Fratricellian Spiritualist, named Rainalducci, who took the name of Nicholas V. He was the last of the imperial antipopes, as Louis was the last emperor excommunicated by a Pope. Nicholas V., antipope.

Louis' arrogance had reached its height. It was soon to be followed by its punishment. Four days after he had decreed the deposition of the Pope the sentence of his own excommunication and deposition was publicly affixed to the door of St. Peter's by James Colonna, Canon of St. John Lateran. The publication of the sentence, together with the heavy taxes imposed by Louis for the support of himself and his antipope, alienated most of his followers. Robert of Naples (1309-43), taking advantage of his difficulties, led an army towards Rome. Louis, fearing to meet his rival, withdrew from Rome with his antipope on the 4th of August, amidst the curses and derision of the people. After meeting with a number of reverses in Lombardy, he returned to Germany, in 1330, having done all he could to destroy the imperial authority in Italy. Louis' deposition promulgated in Rome. He is compelled to

The antipope, finding that his patron's cause was on the wane, abjured (1330) the schism, and expressed public regret for his past conduct in the Cathedral of Pisa. He shortly afterwards went to Avignon, where he appeared with a rope about his neck, and threw himself at the feet of John. The latter raised him up, gave him the kiss of peace, and treated him with great consideration and kindness during the remaining three years of his life. Submission of the antipope to John XXII. (1330).

On his return to Germany, Louis expressed his anxiety to become reconciled to the Holy See on condition that his claims to the imperial crown should be recognised·

Louis seeks reconciliation with the Pope.

With this condition, however, John was unwilling to comply as Louis' past conduct in raising up an antipope, and forming an alliance with the Fratricellian Spiritualists and other enemies[1] of the Papacy had thoroughly disqualified him for an office the chief duty of which would be the protection of the Holy See and the exaltation of the Church. The quarrel was still raging when John died, in 1334, at the advanced age of ninety years.

Said to have erred regarding the Beatific Vision.

John has been sometimes charged with having fallen into error on the question of the Beatific Vision. At this time it was freely disputed, especially between the Dominicans and some Franciscans, whether the souls of the just, though admitted into heaven, enjoyed the Beatific Vision before the general judgment. The Dominicans defended the affirmative opinion against their opponents. It has been asserted by many writers that John took the side of the latter in the controversy.

Reasons for the statement.

The only reasons for saying that he erred are the following:—(*a*) A Dominican, named Thomas Waleys, was imprisoned by John, in 1331, for having denounced in unmeasured terms as heretics all who defended the Franciscan opinion. (*b*) In some of his public addresses he referred at length to the arguments from Sacred Scripture

[1] Such as the two doctors of theology, John of Jandun, and Marsilius of Padua, who wrote the well-known work, *Defensor Pacis*, to support the claims of their imperial patron. In it they laid down numerous heretical doctrines regarding the constitution of the Church. They maintained, for instance that Christ appointed no visible head over His Church; that the Primacy of St. Peter was a fable invented to support the ambition of Popes; that the emperor alone could raise one bishop above another; that this precedence was revocable at pleasure; that it was the exclusive privilege of the emperor to convoke General Councils; and that he received his power immediately from the people, in whom all legislative and judicial authority ultimately resided.

and tradition in favour of each opinion, without making either his own. And (*c*) he sent two representatives on an important mission to Paris, in 1333. During their stay there they gave expression to the belief that the just were not admitted to the immediate enjoyment of God till after the general resurrection. From which it was inferred by many that they were but voicing the teaching of the Pope whom they represented. The King, having consulted the theological faculty of the University on the matter, wrote a sharp letter to the Pope, reproving him for teaching a heterodox doctrine, and calling on him to withdraw it.

His teaching orthodox.

It is obvious that these reasons are insufficient to connect the name of John with erroneous teaching on the question of the Beatific Vision. Nor are we left without direct arguments to show that his views were orthodox. First, one of his representatives at Paris declared that he did not hold the opinion attributed to him by the King.[1] Secondly, in canonizing Louis, Bishop of Toulouse, in 1317, he speaks of the saint being admitted to the full enjoyment of God.[2] Thirdly, the Paris doctors, replying to the King's question regarding the Beatific Vision, declared that they had it on the most reliable authority that the Pope merely referred to the opinion attributed to him without holding it.[3] And, fourthly, John himself in replying to

---

[1] Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 162.

[2] Tandem gloriosus resolutus in mortem qui hic vivus ambulavit in innocentia in medio domus suae ad Deum contemplandum in gaudio *facie revelata* in sua innocentia est ingressus. *Bullarium* (Rome, 1741), vol. iii., pt. 2, page 147.

[3] "Non asserendo seu opinando protulit (illam sententiam), sed solummodo recitando." The reply of the Paris doctors, which was preserved in the University archives, is published in the history of the University. See Natalis Alexander, *Dissert. in Saec.* xiii. et xiv., Diss. xi., art. 2.

Philip of France denied[1] that his teaching had been accurately represented.

Confession of faith made on his death bed.

Whatever doubt there may be—and there can be very little—regarding the private opinion of John for a time, it is certain—(*a*) that it could not have been heretical, as the Catholic doctrine on the point had not been then defined; (*b*) that his official teaching was always orthodox; and (*c*) that his private opinion towards the end of life was orthodox. For, on the day before his death, which occurred on the 4th of December, 1334, he made a profession of faith in presence of the cardinals, in which he declared[2] that the souls of the just are admitted to the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision as soon as the temporal punishment due to their sins has been discharged.

Benedict XII. (1334-42).

On the death of John XXII.[3] the cardinals elected as his successor another Frenchman named James Fournier, who took the name of Benedict XII. The new Pope was born of humble parents, at Saverdun, and was highly esteemed for his learning, his austerity, and his charity to the poor. He joined the Cistercians at an early age, and

---

[1] "Cum autem," he wrote, "hanc quaestionem B. Augustinus in scriptis suis reputaverit valde dubiam, et circa eam variasse dicatur, et nedum ipse sed et multi doctores circa istam materiam varient; propter hoc ut veritas possit melius aperiri, nos interdum in nostris sermonibus mentionem habuimus *non proferendo verbum de capite nostro*, sed dicta S. Scripturae et sanctorum, praecipue illorum quorum scripturae ab ecclesia sunt receptae." Apud Raynaldum, Ad an. 1333.

[2] Fatemur siquidem et credimus quod animae purgatae, separatae a corporibus, sunt in coelo coelorumque regno ac paradiso, et cum Christo in consortio angelorum congregatae et vident Deum ac Divinam Essentiam *facie ad faciem*. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1334.

[3] He left a large amount of money after him intended for a crusade, which the difficulties of his pontificate rendered it impossible to organize. According to J. Villani (xi. 20), whose estimate appears to be exaggerated, he left 25,000,000 gold florins. A gold florin was equal to about 7*s*. 6*d*.

was afterwards made Bishop of Mirepoix, and Cardinal of St. Prisca. He applied himself energetically throughout his pontificate (1334-42) to reform abuses of different kinds that happened to come under his notice. For instance, he ordered those ecclesiastics who had come to Avignon in large numbers, expecting some position of emolument in the Church, to return to their homes; abolished commendams,[1] except such as were held by cardinals, and expectancies, which, with annats,[3] formed the great source of his predecessor's wealth. In all his ecclesiastical appointments he appeared to have been guided solely by the suitableness of the candidate for the office to which he was raised.

He reforms different abuses.

Benedict was careful to keep his relatives at a distance from him. We are told that on one occasion his niece and her husband came to Avignon expecting some favour from him; but they were much disappointed at being told by Benedict that "as James Fournier he knew them; but that as Pope he had no kindred, and could only give them his blessing."[4]

His conduct towards his relatives.

While Benedict, who was specially noted for his peaceful disposition, manifested a readiness to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of the princes of Europe, and especially Philip of France, in order to avoid disputes of all kinds, to which he was so averse; he also showed that he was equally ready to assert his independence when the call of duty required it. Thus, when the King of France asked

His firmness in dealing with the King of France.

---

[1] Vacant benefices given in charge to another during the period of vacancy are styled *Commendams.*

[2] *Expectancies* are benefices not yet vacant.

[3] *Annats* are the first year's revenues of vacant benefices.

[4] Rob., vii. 128.

that the money collected by John XXII. for a crusade should be granted to him, as well as other concessions incompatible with the rights of the Church, he replied (1336) that if he had two souls he would gladly sacrifice one for the King; but that, as he had only one, he should endeavour to save it.

The Bull *Benedictus Deus.*

He settled the theological controversy that had distracted the latter years of his predecessor's pontificate by the Bull *Benedictus Deus* (1336), in which he defined that the souls of the just that have no guilt to expiate, enjoy the Beatific Vision immediately after death. And he laid the foundation of a Papal palace at Avignon, thereby giving his successors an additional interest to remain in that city.

Continuation of struggle between the Papacy and the empire.

Benedict was sincerely desirous of effecting a reconciliation between Louis and the Holy See. But various obstacles were thrown in his way:—(*a*) Philip VI. of France (1328-50), fearing that Louis, if once firmly established on the German throne, would assist the English King in his French wars, used his influence to prevent a reconciliation. (*b*) The electors of Germany sought to deprive the Holy See of an ancient privilege by promulgating a decree at Rhense, in 1338, that the choice of the majority of the electoral princes should be King of Germany and Rome, without any reference to the Pope. (*c*) Louis himself shortly afterwards issued a constitution, directed against the Holy See, in which it was laid down that the imperial rights came immediately from God, and were, therefore, independent of any grant on the part of the Popes. And (*d*) Louis was so far carried away by his extravagant pretensions, that he pronounced the marriage between the Countess of Tyrol and the son of the King of Bohemia invalid, and

undertook to grant a dispensation in the impediment of consanguinity between her and his own son; thus making it impossible for his claims to the imperial crown to be recognised by the Pope.

Clement VI. (1342-52).

The quarrel between the Papacy and the empire continued during the first half of the pontificate of Clement VI. (1342-52). At his request, five of the prince electors met at Rhense, in 1346, and gave their votes to Charles IV., son of the King of Bohemia. Louis was making elaborate preparations to defend his claims to the throne against his rival, when he died suddenly, in 1347, from a stroke of apoplexy. A successor was elected by his followers in the person of Gunther of Schwarzburg. But the most of them soon transferred their allegiance to Charles, who was crowned at Aachen, in 1349, and acknowledged as king throughout Germany.

Death of Louis (1347)

Purchase of Avignon and creation of French cardinals

Clement purchased Avignon from Joanna of Naples (1343-82); lived in a style of great splendour; built magnificent palaces for the cardinals; re-introduced the sources of Papal revenue abolished by Benedict XII.; created one Italian and nine French cardinals, of whom four were his own relatives; and raised many other relatives to positions of honour and emolument in the Church.

The Pope requested to go to Rome.

The Romans, who suffered severely from the absence of the Papal Court, sent representatives (1342) to Avignon beseeching the Pope to return to the Eternal City. Its claims were eloquently pleaded by Petrarch,[1] who was a

[1] Petrarch, the greatest of Italian lyric poets, was born at Arezzo, in 1304. His father, who was a Florentine by birth, had been forced to leave his native city at the same time as Dante. When he was about eight years of age he accompanied his father to Avignon. Here he became acquainted,

member of the embassy. Clement, in replying, expressed his desire to go to Rome; but urged that his presence was still necessary in France, in order to terminate, if possible, the struggle which was being carried on between that country and England.

Rienzi.

The continued absence of the Popes from Italy had a most baneful effect on their civil sway in that country. The Papal States became a prey to different factions struggling for supremacy. The disturbed condition of the country was taken advantage of by a demagogue, named Rienzi, to establish a republican form of government in Rome. He was a man of low origin, whose mind had been fired by the study of Latin literature, with the desire of reviving the glories of pagan Rome; and was endowed with considerable powers of eloquence, which he freely used in filling the minds of his fellow-citizens with his own republican dreams.

Establishes a Republic in Rome (1347)

Having gained a sufficient number of followers to give effect to his schemes, he summoned the Romans to the Capitol, in 1347, and proclaimed a republican form of government,[1] with himself as tribune. He destroyed the castles of the nobles in the vicinity of Rome, and restored order where disorder had previously reigned. His success appeared for a time complete; and he was hailed everywhere as the saviour of Rome and Italy.

---

about the year 1327, with the beautiful Laura, who is said to have exercised a wonderful influence on the character of his poetry. He was crowned Poet Laureate on the Capitol, in 1341. Having taken his final departure From Avignon, in 1352, he returned to his native country, where he died, in 1374.

[1] The public mind had been to some extent prepared for the acceptance of his schemes by the writings of such men as Dante and Petrarch, who advocated the selection of Rome as the seat of the empire as well as of the Papacy.

It soon, however, became apparent that Rienzi lacked the prudence and administrative tact that would have enabled him to retain his usurped authority and preserve the new Constitution he had introduced. His head was turned by his temporary success. He claimed extravagant titles; lived in excessive pomp and luxury; imposed heavy taxes on his subjects to maintain his costly court; summoned the Pope to return to Rome; and cited the rival claimants to the German throne to submit their disputes to his tribunal. These and similar acts made the Romans disgusted with his rule. He was at length deposed, after a brief reign of half a year, and compelled to consult for his safety in flight.

His arrogance and expulsion from Rome.

Being shortly afterwards taken prisoner by Charles IV. of Germany, he was sent to Avignon, in 1350, on the charge of heresy. After being kept in confinement here for a short time he was released; and returned to Italy, in 1353, in company with Cardinal Albornoz, who was sent to re-establish the Papal authority in that country. On his arrival in Rome he was hailed with great enthusiasm, and was invested with the dignity of Senator, on the 1st of August, 1354. But relapsing shortly afterwards into his former excesses, he aroused the indignation of the Romans, who rose in revolt against his authority, and cut him to pieces on the 8th of October.

He is arrested and sent to Avignon (1350).

His death (1354).

It was during the pontificate of Clement VI. that the Black Plague, supposed to have been of Eastern origin, visited Europe (1347-48). Its ravages were so severe that it is said to have carried away a fourth of the population in some countries, and even more in others. It visited Ireland; but it is worthy of remark that it only attacked

The Black Plague (1347-8).

the English settlers there.[1] It was generally attributed at the time to the Jews, who were accused of poisoning the wells. This led to their persecution in many places, notwithstanding the earnest efforts made by Clement on their behalf.

The Flagellants.

The Black Plague gave rise to a fanatical sect called Flagellants, who first made their appearance in Hungary, from which they rapidly spread into other countries. They maintained that the plague had been sent as a punishment for sin, and that it could be stopped only by the practice of austerities. "Divided into companies of male and female devotees, under a leader and two masters, they stripped themselves naked to the waist, and publicly scourged themselves, or each other, till their shoulders were covered with blood. This expiatory ceremony was repeated each morning and afternoon for thirty-three days, equal in number to the years which Christ is thought to have lived on earth; after which they returned to their former employments, cleansed from sin by the baptism of blood."[2]

Agreement among the cardinals on the death of Clement.

On the death of Clement VI., the cardinals, before proceeding to elect a successor, bound themselves by an agreement that whoever should be appointed Pope would give half the income of the Roman Church to the cardinals; that he would add no new member to the Sacred College till its number was reduced to sixteen; and that he would obtain the consent of their body before creating or deposing a cardinal.

Having fully secured, as they believed, their privileges,

---

[1] Lingard, *History of England*, iii. 155.
[2] *Ibidem*, iii. 159.

they elected a new Pope in the person of the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, a Limousin by birth, who took the name of Innocent VI. (1352-62). One of his first official acts was to declare the agreement entered into by the cardinals invalid. He abolished commendams; commanded bishops and other beneficiaries to observe the laws of residence under the penalty of excommunication; and reformed various other abuses both in the Papal Court and throughout Christendom.

Innocent VI. (1352-62).

As already mentioned, he sent Cardinal Albornoz to Italy, 1353, to restore the civil authority of the Holy See in that country. Albornoz, who was a Spaniard by birth, had been trained to military service in his youth, and was much more distinguished as a soldier than as a churchman. After a campaign extending over fourteen years (1354-67), he succeeded by his tact and bravery in bringing back to their former allegiance the subjects of the Holy See. Charles IV., having crossed the Alps, in 1355, was crowned with the iron crown of Lombardy, at Milan, and received the imperial crown immediately afterwards, at Rome, from the hands of the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia.

Card. Albornoz restores the civil authority of the Popes in Italy.

On the death of Innocent VI., the choice of the cardinals fell on William of Grimoard, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Victor, near Marseilles. He took the name of Urban V. (1362-70). and continued to cultivate as Pope the many virtues for which he had been distinguished as monk.

Urban V. (1362-70).

Urban resolved from the very beginning of his pontificate to restore the Papal Court to Rome. He was confirmed in his resolution by the repeated entreaties of the Romans as well as by the advice of Charles IV., who visited him at Avignon, in 1365; but was strongly opposed

He goes to Rome (1367).

by the cardinals, who were mostly French, and by the King of France. At length he publicly announced his intention, in 1366, of going to Rome in the course of the following year. He left Avignon on the 30th of April, 1367, accompanied by all the cardinals, except five, who remained behind, and entered Rome, on the 24th of October, amidst the enthusiastic greetings of the people. During his stay there, he received the homage of the Emperors of Germany and Constantinople, the Queen of Naples, and the King of Cyprus.

His return to Avignon, and death (1370).

After spending three years in Italy, yielding to the advice of the French cardinals and to his own desire to put an end to the war between France and England, he returned to Avignon, in 1370. Various efforts were made to dissuade him from leaving Rome, but with no result. St. Bridget,[1] of Sweden, who was staying in Rome at the

[1] She was of royal descent, and was born near Upsala, in 1302. When only sixteen years of age she married the Prince of Nericia, by whom she had eight children, the youngest being St. Catherine († 1381), the favourite Saint of Sweden. In 1337 she and her husband took a vow of continence, and resolved to devote themselves to lives of penance and prayer. The latter having died five years later, after returning from a pilgrimage to Compostella, St. Bridget divided her estates among her children, resigned the rank of princess, and entered on a life of extreme asceticism.

She founded a convent at Wadstena, in which the rule of St. Augustine was observed, and close by a monastery for priests, who were to attend to the spiritual wants of the nuns. This was but the beginning of an Order which spread rapidly throughout Scandinavia. She went to Rome during the jubilee of 1350; and founded an hospice there for pilgrims and students from her native country. She spent the remainder of her life in the Eternal City, with the exception of a short time when she was absent on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

She claimed the gift of prophecy. The revelations said to have been vouchsafed to her were committed to writing by her confessor, and were fiercely assailed by Gerson. An attempt was made to have them approved by

time warned him that he should not survive his return to France long. Her prophecy was fulfilled on the 9th of December, 1370, three months after the Pope's arrival at Avignon.

Gregory XI. (1370-78).

Urban was succeeded by Cardinal Peter, nephew of Clement VI., who took the name of Gregory XI. (1370-78). The most notable event of his pontificate was the final restoration of the Papal Court to Rome. Many causes are said to have contributed to bring about this result, of which the following were the principal :—(*a*) The history of the last half century has made it sufficiently clear that it would be impossible for the Popes to retain their temporal sovereignty in Italy without residing in that country. This was one of the reasons urged by St. Bridget to dissuade Urban from returning to France. (*b*) The Italians were so dissatisfied with the continued absence of the French Popes from their see that many of them were seriously contemplating the appointment of an antipope. Their intention was made known to Gregory by his legate in Italy. (*c*) St. Catherine [1] of Sienna, having been sent

Causes that determined him to restore the Papal Court to Rome

---

the Council of Basle, but without success. Benedict XIV., speaking of these and similar revelations, says we may give them the credence warranted by the historical evidence on which they rest. (*De Canoniz. Sanctorum*, Lib. ii., cap. xxxii., n. 11.)

[1] She was born of humble and pious parents at Sienna, in 1347. At the early age of seven she consecrated her virginity to God, and entered on a life of extreme asceticism. When she was eighteen years old she became a tertiary Dominican ; and for three years afterwards is said not to have spoken to anyone except God and her confessor. Her mortifications seem almost incredible. She frequently fasted for weeks, her only food being the Blessed Eucharist. Like St. Francis of Assisi, she was favoured with the Stigmata, which were invisible, and manifested themselves in the intense pain from which she suffered at regular intervals.

The fame of St. Catherine's piety and miracles secured for her a promi-

by the Florentines to Avignon, in 1376, to negotiate terms of peace between them and the Pope, strongly urged him to come to Italy ; and made known a secret vow he had taken before his elevation to the Papacy, that in case he should be elected he would restore the Papal Court to Rome.

His arrival in Rome (377)

Influenced by these and other considerations, Gregory took his departure from Avignon on the 13th of September, 1376, and arrived in Rome on the 17th of the following January, thus terminating the so-called Babylonian Captivity of the Papacy. We are told that he found the public buildings of Rome so dilapidated, and the affairs of Italy so unsettled, that he was thinking of returning to France, when death intervened, in 1378, to prevent him from carrying out his intention.

The residence of the Popes at Avignon prejudicial to the interests of the Papacy.

The residence of the Popes at Avignon was prejudicial to the best interests of the Papacy. First, it gave the vassals of the Holy See an opportunity of asserting their independence. Though they were afterwards reduced to subjection by Cardinal Albornoz, it was only after a severe struggle, which left bitter memories in the minds of the vanquished. And thus was the re-

---

nence and influence enjoyed by few in any age. Hence we find that when Florence was laid under interdict, in 1375, for having entered into a league with other cities against the civil authority of the Pope, and its commerce thereby threatened with ruin, the magistrates turned to her, and asked her mediation with Gregory in their behalf. On her arrival at Avignon she was received by the Pope and cardinals with every mark of distinction, and the settlement of the quarrel was placed entirely in her hands. Owing, however, to the treachery of the Florentines, a reconciliation was not affected between them and the Holy See till the following pontificate. She passed to her reward at Rome, in 1380, at the early age of 33.

tention[1] of the temporal sovereignty by the Popes made the more difficult. Secondly, it was too often believed that the French Popes were ruled by the kings of France, and swayed by the interests of their country in their relations with the rest of the Catholic world to the great detriment of their temporal power and civil influence. And, thirdly, the heavy taxes which most of the French Popes, deprived as they were of the patrimony of St. Peter, were obliged to impose in order to raise stately edifices and support a costly court, excited dissatisfaction in many countries, especially in England; and thus contributed to weaken the ties that bound these countries to the Holy See.

---

[1] The Avignon Popes completed the Body of Canon Law, which consists of—(*a*) the Decree of Gratian, comprising the decretals and canons down to the time of Alexander III., arranged and explained under several headings; (*b*) the collection of decretals made by Raymond of Pennaforte, in 1230, at the request of Gregory IX.; (*c*) the Sextus Decretalium, or Sext of Boniface VIII., in five books, containing the decretals issued after the time of Gregory IX.; (*d*) the Clementines, or constitutions issued by Clement V.; and the Extravagantes of John XXII., or such constitutions as had not been embodied in any previous collection.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE KNIGHTS TEMPLARS.

Their wealth.

THE Knights Templars, the best known of the Military Orders, were founded, as we have seen, early in the twelfth century, to protect pilgrims on their way to the Holy Land and to guard the Holy Places of the East against desecration by the infidels. They soon acquired a high character for piety and bravery, and became the recipients of liberal donations from Christians throughout the world.

Various abuses among the Templars.

The immense wealth[1] of which they thus became possessed brought with it a relaxation of discipline which was soon followed by more serious abuses. We find, for instance, that the disrespect shown by them to the Holy See, and ecclesiastical authority in general, was severely censured by the third General Council of Lateran,[2] in

[1] Thus William of Tyre († 1179) writes:—"Possessiones tam ultra quam citra mare adeo dicuntur habere immensas ut jam non sit in orbe Christiano provincia quae praedictis fratribus bonorum suorum portionem non contulerit; et regiis opulentiis pares hodie dicuntur habere copias." Quoted by Dupuy († 1651), who in his work, *Histoire de la Condamnation des Templiers*, gives numerous extracts bearing on the condemnation of the Templars.

[2] Can. 9. "Fratrum autem et co-episcoporum nostrorum vehementi conquestione comperimus quod fratres Templi et Hospitalis alii quoque religiosae professionis, indulta sibi ab Apostolica Sede excedentes privilegia contra episcopalem auctoritatem multa praesumunt quae et scandalum generant in populo Dei, et grave pariunt periculum animarum."—Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vi., pars ii., 1677.

1179, and by Innocent III.[1] in a letter written about thirty years later; while the rulers of different countries had frequent cause to complain that the Templars took advantage of their being a religious Order to oppose civil authority, and, at the same time, claim exemption from its jurisdiction.[2] And they were guilty of various other excesses, as appears from the letter of Pope Innocent just referred to, as well as from the writings of contemporary historians.[3] Their intemperance, for instance, was so notorious, that to drink like a Templar had passed into a proverb before the end of the thirteenth century.

Origin of these abuses.

Nor is it difficult to understand how abuses could have been easily introduced among the Templars, if we bear in mind—(*a*) that they were mostly recruited from a class of society not generally the most remarkable for religious fervour; (*b*) that they had no novitiate in which to lay the foundation of spiritual perfection; and (*c*) that during their stay in the East they were brought into contact with the Saracens and others whose lax morals had a baneful effect on their lives.

The arrogance of the Templars as well as the other vices of which they were generally believed to be guilty

---

[1] In writing (1207) to the Grand Master of the Templars, he says:—"Fratrum et co-episcoporum nostrorum graves querelae super gravibus fratrum vestrorum excessibus apostolicis auribus saepius inculcatae animum nostrum nequeunt non turbare, cum in nostrum et generalis Ecclesiae scandalum et animarum suarum periculum et ordines vestri dispendium attententur; qui apostatantes a Domino et a puritate sui ordinis recedentes in superbia sua usque adeo effrenantur ut in faciem Romanae Ecclesiae quae fratres Militiae Templi suis beneficiis fovere non desinit maculam impingere non vereantur,"—*Epp.* x., 121; *Lat. Patrol.*, ccv. 1213.

[2] Dupin, *Eccl. Writers* ii. 495.

[3] They are charged, for instance, by William of Tyre, and Matthew of Paris, with excessive pride and arrogance. See Dupuy (Brussels, 1713), i. 275.

Philip the Fair resolves to bring about the suppression of the Templars.

aroused against them a strong spirit of opposition throughout Christendom. This opposition was availed of by Philip the Fair of France to bring about their suppression. His bitter hostility to them is generally traced—(*a*) to his jealousy at their wealth and the magnificence of their Temple[1] in Paris, in comparison with which the royal palace appeared but poor; (*b*) to this desire to get rid of his obligations to the Templars for the money he had borrowed from them to pay the dowry of his sister, who was married to the King of England; and (*c*) to the hope of being enabled to confiscate their possessions in France, and thereby replenish his exhausted coffers.[2]

Revelations against the Order (1305).

The confessions made, in 1305, by Squin of Florian, and another French Templar, presented Philip with the desired opportunity of proceeding against the Order. These Templars were confined in prison for certain crimes of which they had been convicted, and conspired to secure their release by making revelations against their fellow-religious. They sent a message to Philip that they had most important information to make known to his majesty regarding the wickedness of their Order. The King immediately directed that they should be brought before him. Being admitted to the royal presence, they declared that the Templars were guilty of the most horrible crimes. Their confessions were shortly afterwards placed by the King before Clement V. on the occasion of his coronation, with the view of securing his co-operation

[1] Hence when Henry III. visited Louis IX., in 1254, he preferred to stay at The Temple than at the King's palace,

[2] Dupuy, i. 289.

[3] Squin of Florian and his brother prisoner were rewarded by being released from imprisonment. Dupuy, i, 291.

against the Order; but the Pope refused to believe them. At another meeting, held nearly two years later (May, 1307), at Poitiers, Philip renewed his appeal to Clement, using alternately threats and promises to attain his object.

Superiors of the Templars ask for an inquiry into the charges made against them.

The Superiors of the Templars, finding that the feeling of opposition to them was daily growing stronger, owing to the circulation of numerous reports injurious to their character, which were generally credited, petitioned the Pope to institute an inquiry into the truth of these charges that they might have an opportunity of vindicating their institute. The Pope in reply expressed his readiness to accede to their demand; and made known his intention to Philip, in a letter dated the 24th of August, 1307.

Imprisonment of the French Templars (1307).

The Pope's proposal did not meet with the approval of the King. The latter feared that an inquiry would be too tedious, and might not have a satisfactory issue for his purpose. He, therefore, resolved to proceed summarily on his own authority against the Templars within his dominions. Before taking action, however, he consulted the Paris doctors. They replied on the 15th of August, 1307, that it was not competent for a civil ruler to suppress a religious Order on a charge of heresy without the sanction of the Church; but that in case of necessity he might place them under arrest for the purpose of afterwards bringing them before ecclesiastical tribunals. Acting on the strength of this opinion, Philip forwarded letters, on the 12th of September, to the military authorities throughout France, ordering them to have the necessary forces in readiness to give effect to sealed instructions which were enclosed, and which were not to be opened till the 12th of October. When the instructions were opened on the appointed day, it was found that the Templars were to be

placed under arrest the next morning. The royal orders were kept strictly private, and were faithfully carried out on the 13th of October The King at the same time issued a decree to the inquisitors throughout France, enjoining them to proceed at once to investigate the charges against the Templars, and to use freely the secular power in inflicting condign punishment on such as were found guilty.

Protest of Clement V.

The suppression of a religious Order by a civil ruler was a usurpation of ecclesiastical authority hitherto unknown. It drew forth a strong letter of protest from Clement, who, moreover, suspended the authority of the inquisitors throughout France, reserving to himself the right to inquire into the charges against the Templars.

He authorizes the arrest of the Templars in other Kingdoms.

Philip sought to conciliate the Pope by writing a most submissive letter, stating that he had not intended to violate the rights of the Church, as his action was directed merely against members of the Order, and not against the Order itself. And he further declared that his summary proceedings had been fully justified by the numerous confessions of guilt made by those whom he had arrested. Influenced by the evidence of guilt placed before him by Philip, and fearing that his continued refusal to take action against the Templars would be construed as an approval of their guilt, the Pope issued a decree towards the end of 1307, ordering the princes of Christendom to arrest them in the name of the Holy See, so that the charges against them might be fully investigated.

In the month of May of the following year, seventy-two members of the Order were sent by Philip to Poitiers to be examined by the Pope in person. They freely confessed that they had been guilty of various disgraceful

crimes. James of Molay, the Grand Master, and other high officials of the Order, were also sent to Poitiers for examination. But feigning sickness on the way, they refused to go further than Chinon. Here they were examined by three cardinals sent by the Pope for the purpose, and admitted the charges[1] against the Order. The principal charges admitted by those examined by the Pope and the cardinals were—(*a*) that they denied Christ on being admitted into the Order; (*b*) that they were obliged to spit on the cross out of disrespect for the symbol of redemption; (*c*) that they had been guilty of various acts of immorality; (*d*) that they were required in accordance with the customs of the institute to adore an idol; and (*e*) that priests of the Order mutilated the Canon of the Mass by omitting the words of consecration.

Confessions of guilt by numerous Templars (1308).

Chief charges admitted by them.

Moved by the confessions[2] of guilt made by the

[1] James of Molay and the Preceptor of Normandy, who admitted their guilt at Chinon, afterwards retracted at Paris, in 1309, and declared that their previous confessions had been extorted from them by violence. They subsequently, however, acknowledged their guilt on the 11th of March, 1314, before the Papal Commissioners who sat at Paris to pass judgment on the chief officials of the Order. But on being condemned to imprisonment for life, they again retracted; upon which the Commissioners adjourned till the following day to consider how they should be dealt with in view of their fresh relapse. The King, on hearing what had occurred, intervened, and without consulting any person, ordered them to be burned as relapsed heretics.

[2] The confessions of guilt made by the superiors of the Order are thus described by Clement himself in the Constitution referred to:—"Magistri et Praeceptores Franciae, Terrae Ultramarinae, Normanniae, Aquitaniae ac Pictaviae coram ipsis tribus Cardinalibus, praesentibus quator tabellionibus publicis et multis aliis bonis viris, ad sancta Dei Evangelia ab eis corporaliter tacta, praestito juramento, quod super praemissis omnibus meram et plenam dicerent veritatem, coram ipsis singulariter *libere et sponte, absque coactione qualibet et timore* deposuerunt et confessi fuerunt inter caetera, Christi abnegationem et spuitionem super crucem, cum in ordinem Templi

Templars, Clement issued the constitution *Faciens Misericordiam*, restoring their former powers to the French inquisitors, in August, 1308. He stipulated, however, that the property of the Templars should be preserved intact till the General Council which he was about to convoke should pass judgment on the Order, and that the chief officials should be reserved to his own tribunal. The Pope, moreover, appointed, at the same time, special commissioners in France and other countries to collect evidence for the information of the future council.

The Constitution *Faciens Misericordiam.*

Papal Commissioners inquire into the guilt of the Templars in France (1309-11)

The Papal Commissioners appointed for France commenced their labours on the 7th of August, 1309; and continued them till the 26th of May, 1311, with the exception of an interval of about eight months, in the year 1310, during which they suspended their sitting, in order that the terror inspired by the burning of fifty-nine Templars (May 12th, 1310), at Paris, who had been convicted of heresy by the ordinary inquisitorial tribunals of the country, should pass away. The Acts of the Paris Commission have been published by Michelet in his *Procès des Templiers*. Of the three hundred and seventy Templars

---

recepti fuerunt; et quidam ex eis se sub eadem forma, scilicet, cum abnegatione Christi et spuitione super crucem, fratres multos recepisse. Sunt etiam quidam ex eis quaedam alia horribilia et inhonesta confessi, quae ut eorum ad praesens parcamus verecundiae, subticemus. Dixerunt praeterea et confessi fuerunt, esse verba quae in eorum confessionibus et depositionibus continentur quas dudum fecerant coram inquisitore haereticae pravitatis.

"Quae confessiones et depositiones dictorum Magistri et Praeceptorum in scripturam publicam per quatuor tabellarios publicos redactae in ipsorum Magistri et Praeceptorum et quorumdam aliorum bonorum virorum praesentia, ac deinde interposito aliquorum dierum spatio coram ipsis eisdem lectae fuerunt de mandato et in praesentia Cardinalium praedictorum et in suo vulgari expositae cuilibet eorumdem. Qui perseverantes in illis, eas expresse et sponte, prout recitatae fuerant, approbarunt . . ." Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1308, n. vii.

examined by them three hundred and three pleaded guilty to the denial of God or Christ; three hundred and eighteen, to spitting on the cross; two hundred and twenty-three, to sins against chastity; and eleven, to the adoration of an idol. The confessions of guilt were even more numerous before the ordinary inquisitorial tribunals, owing to the free use of torture[1] in extorting evidence, a practice sanctioned by the criminal jurisprudence of the age.

The English and Irish Templars arrested and examined.

In accordance with the instructions received from Clement, the Templars were placed under arrest in England and Ireland[2] on the 10th of January, 1308. The President of the Commission appointed to inquire into their guilt was Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, a man who was highly esteemed for his well-known honesty and firmness of character. The inquiry continued for three years,[3] during which many of the Templars admitted their guilt. The culprits, however, were by no means as numerous as in France. Hence, Dr. Lingard says[4] that "If it be fair to judge by the informations taken in England, however we condemn a few individuals, we must certainly acquit the Order." The evidence, however, against the Templars recently published shows conclusively that they were much worse in other countries than in England and Ireland. Many of the Italian Templars also admitted their guilt. Very few, however, were convicted in Germany and Spain, owing in no small degree to

[1] Torture was used to extort the confession of guilt only when there was *prima facie* evidence that the accused was guilty.

[2] The royal edict ordering their arrest is given by Rymer, *Foedera*, &c., iii., 34.

[3] The process against the English Templars is fully given by Wilkins. *Conc. Britanniae et Hiberniae*, ii., 329-401.

[4] *History of England*, iii. 79.

the difficulty of bringing them before the inquisitorial tribunals.

The various commissions having completed their labours in 1311, it remained for the General Council that had been convoked to pass sentence on the Order in the light of the evidence collected.

The Fifteenth General Council of Vienne (1311-12).

Convocation of the council.

The Council was convoked by Clement V., in 1308, to meet at Vienne on the 1st of October, 1310. It was afterwards (April, 1310) postponed till the 1st of October in the following year, to enable the Papal commissioners to collect more evidence. The Council opened at Vienne on the day appointed. The number[1] of bishops present is variously estimated at between one hundred and fourteen and three hundred.

Held for a triple purpose.

The Pope, who presided in person, in addressing the fathers at the first General Session (October 16th), explained[2] the chief subjects that were to occupy their attention, viz.—(*a*) the charges against the Knights Templars; (*b*) the organization of a crusade; and (*c*) the condemnation of errors against faith, and the enactment of disciplinary canons for the better government of the Church.

The question of the Templars was generally admitted to be the most urgent. A committee consisting of a large number of members was appointed to examine the

[1] Villani and St. Antoninus say that there were over three hundred bishops present, while the continuator of William of Nanges and others say that only one hundred and fourteen attended. Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1311, n. liv., note by Mansi.

[2] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 1360.

evidence collected, and to recommend to the Council the course that should be adopted in dealing with the Order. Having examined the evidence, all agreed that grave abuses prevailed among the Templars, but differed for a time as to how they should be dealt with. Some considered that the charges had been sufficiently proved against the Order to warrant its condemnation; while the majority were of opinion that further inquiry should be instituted before having recourse to such an extreme measure.

Committee appointed to inquire into the case of the Templars.

A compromise was, however, suggested by some members of the committee, which immediately met with general approval, viz., that the Order should be suppressed, not by way of condemnation, but by way of provision, as the good of the Church seemed to require it. The recommendation having been adopted by the Council, the Pope gave effect to it in the Bull *Vox in Excelso*,[1] which was

The Order suppressed by the Bull *Vox in Excelso* (1312).

---

[1] "Considerantes itaque infamiam, suspicionem, clamosam insinuationem et alia supradicta quae contra Ordinem faciunt supradictum . . . ; attendentes insuper grave scandalum ex praedictis contra Ordinem praelibatum sub ortum fuisse, quod non videretur posse sedari eodem Ordine remanente, nec non et fidei et animarum pericula, et quam plurimorum fratrum dicti Ordinis horribilia multa facta, et multas alias rationes justas et causas quae nostrum ad infra scripta movere animum rationabiliter et debite potuerunt; quia et *majori parti Cardinalium et praedictorum a toto concilio electorum, plusquam quatuor vel quinque partibus eorumdem*, visum est decentius et expedientius et utilius pro Dei honore et pro conservatione fidei Christianae ac subsidio Terrae Sanctae, multisque aliis validis rationibus, sequendam fore potius viam ordinationis et provisionis Sedis Apostolicae, Ordinem saepe fatum tollendo et bona ad usum ad quem deputata fuerant applicando de personis etiam ipsius Ordinis quae vivunt salubriter providendo, quam defensionis juris observationes et negotii prorogationes, animadvertentes quoque, quod alias etiam sine culpa fratrum, Ecclesia Romana fecit interdum alios Ordines solemnes ex causis incomparabiliter minoribus, quam sint praemissae, cessare. Non sine cordis amaritudine et dolore, *non per modum*

published at the second General Session, held on the 3rd of April, 1312. It was ordered that the property of the suppressed Order should be handed over to the Knights Hospitallers, except such as was required for those members who were declared innocent. The possessions of the Spanish Templars were given to the sovereigns to assist in defraying the expenses of the wars in which they were engaged against the enemies of the Christian faith.

Charge of injustice against the Pope and Council considered.

There have not been wanting writers who charge Clement and the Council of Vienne with injustice in suppressing the Templars. How groundless is this charge will appear if we bear the following considerations in mind:—(*a*) The suppression of the Templars was merely a withdrawal of the approval originally granted by the Church in order to constitute them a religious Order. (*b*) The withdrawal of this approval was not equivalent to a declaration that all members of the Order were guilty, as the opposite was expressly stated. (*c*) The reasons for withdrawing the Church's approval were amply sufficient. For the Order had been completely discredited by the numerous confessions of the most shocking crimes made by many of its members. That the evidence against them was very strong, is sufficiently obvious from the almost unanimous agreement among the members of the Council, taken as

---

definitivae sententiae, sed per modum provisionis seu ordinationis Apostolicae praefatum Templi Ordinem et ejus statum, habitum atque nomen, irrefragabili et perpetua valitura tollimus sanctione, ac perpetuae prohibitioni subjicimus, *Sacro Concilio approbante*, districtius inhibentes, ne quis dictum Ordinem de caetero intrare, vel ejus habitum suscipere vel portare aut pro Templario gerere se praesumat . . . ." Quoted by Jungmann, v. 109, from the *Tübingen Theological Quarterly*, 1866, in which it was published by Hefele.

they were from different countries and different conditions of life. The continuance of such an Order would obviously be a great source of scandal to the faithful. And (*d*) the decision of the Council met with the practically unanimous approval of contemporary writers. Villani, the Florentine historian, is the only notable exception. We can, however, easily understand how he with his strong Italian prejudices would have sought to make a point out of the suppression of the Templars against the first of the Avignon Popes.

The organization of a crusade.

The next question that occupied the attention of the fathers was the organization of a crusade. This was taken up in a very half-hearted way. The only thing done was to decree a grant for that purpose of the ecclesiastical tithes for six years.

Condemnation of errors.

Finally, various decrees were passed on questions of doctrine and discipline. Among the errors condemned by the Council was one borrowed from the philosophy of the Arabic philosopher, Averrhoës, by John of Oliva, who maintained the existence of a rational and a sensitive soul in man.[1] The fathers defined that the rational soul is the *form* of the body, *per se et essentialiter*, thereby excluding the existence of a twofold principle of action.

Disciplinary canons.

The most notable of the disciplinary decrees was that ordering chairs of Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldaic to be established at Paris, Oxford, Bologna, Salamanca, and wherever the Papal Court happened to be. This single enactment would be sufficient to render the Council of Vienne memorable in the history of the Church.

During the sitting of the Council the Pope issued a Bull

---

[1] Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, vii. 1358.

approving of the festival of Corpus Christi,[1] which had been instituted by Urban IV., in 1264, in honour of the Blessed Sacrament.

Clementine Constitutions.

The third and last Session of the Council was held on the 8th of May, 1312. The public pronouncements made by Clement V. during the sitting of the Council and at other times were published after his death, under the name of the *Clementine Constitutions.*

---

[1] The feast appears to have been first established by Robert, Bishop of Liège, for his own diocese, in 1246, in consequence of a vision said to have been vouchsafed to a holy nun named Juliana. In this vision she beheld a full moon with a small part of it in darkness. She said it was revealed to her that the full moon represented the Church, and that the darkness denoted the want of a festival in honour of the Blessed Sacrament.

The festival was approved by Urban IV., in 1264, for the whole Church, because of a miraculous incident that occurred at Bolsena, near Orvieto. We are told that as a priest who had some doubt about the Real Presence was celebrating Mass, a few drops of the consecrated wine fell accidentally on the corporal. Wishing to conceal the accident, he folded the corporal, with the result that the consecrated species left the appearance of blood on all the folds. The corporal is still preserved at Orvieto. The miraculous occurrence was made by Raphael the subject of one of his most beautiful paintings. See Raynaldus, *Annales*; Ad an. 1264, nn. xxvii., xxviii.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.

Nature and duration of the Schism.

THIS, the most remarkable of the many schisms that have disturbed the peace of the Church, commenced during the pontificate of Urban VI., and continued for thirty-nine years. During this period, Christendom was divided in its allegiance between two, and for a time between three, claimants to the Papacy, each having arguments in his favour apparently sufficient to satisfy his followers that he was the lawful Pope. However clear the claims of Urban VI. and his successors may appear to us at present—and there are not wanting some who even still defend the title of Clement VII.—there was much *bona fide* uncertainty during the continuance of the schism as to who the real Pope was. This is sufficiently obvious from the fact that each obedience could point to saints[1] among its members.

We shall treat of the Schism under three heads, viz., its origin, its continuation, and its termination.

A.—*The Origin of the Schism.*[2]

Towards the end of Gregory XI.'s pontificate, party feeling ran very high in Rome. To guard against the

[1] Thus, on the side of Urban were St. Catherine of Sienna and St. Catherine of Sweden; while Clement VII. was acknowledged by St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Peter of Metz.

[2] The chief contemporary authorities on the early history of the schism are Urban VI. and Theodoric of Niem. The former has handed down an account of its origin in a document known as the *Factum*, addressed to the

Constitution Gregory IX. about the election of a successor.

occurrence of a schism he issued a Bull,[1] on the 19th of March, 1378, dispensing with the usual formalities of Papal elections in the appointment of a successor, and decreeing that the cardinals present in Rome at the time of his death might go into conclave in any place they would select, a bare majority of votes in favour of any candidate being declared sufficient.

Election of Urban VI. (1378)

Eight days after issuing this Bull, Gregory, the last of the French Popes, passed to his reward. Of the sixteen[2] cardinals present in Rome at the time, eleven were French; four, Italian; and one, a Spaniard. They entered into conclave on the 7th of April. During the remainder of that day and the whole of the following night, the Romans, fearing that a Frenchman, if elected, would transfer the Papal Court to his own country, surrounded the Vatican, where the cardinals were assembled, clamouring for the appointment of a Roman.[3] Early the next day

---

King of Castile, but intended for the whole of Christendom. The latter, who had been Secretary to Gregory XI., adhered to the Urbanite obedience till the Council of Pisa (1409), when he transferred his allegiance to Alexander V. He was appointed successively to the sees of Verdun and Cambray, but does not appear to have got possession of either. He wrote three works on the Great Western Schism, viz., *De Schismate*, in three books, containing its history down to the election of Alexander V.; the *Nemus Unionis*, in which the chief documents bearing on the schism are given; and his *Vita Joannis XXIII.*, which brings its history down to 1417, the year before the author's death. Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, iii. 59.

The *Factum*, as well as all other important documents that serve to throw any light on the origin of the schism, are fully given by Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1378.

[1] Raynaldus, Ad an. 1378, n. ii.

[2] There were seven cardinals absent, viz., six at Avignon, and one as Papal legate in Tuscany.

[3] They at first asked for a Roman or an Italian; but afterwards restricted the choice of the cardinals to a Roman. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1378, n. iv.

after celebrating two Masses, one of the Holy Ghost, and the other of the Feria, the cardinals unanimously elected one who did not belong to the Sacred College, viz., Bartholomew Prignano,[1] Archbishop of Bari, in Apulia, who was held in high esteem for his piety, zeal, and learning.[2] It was announced to the populace that the choice of the cardinals would be made known shortly afterwards in St. Peter's.

His second election.

On the departure of the mob, the Archbishop of Bari, who happened to be in Rome, was sent for; and on his giving his consent to accept the dignity he was again elected,[3] on the 9th of April, lest the last election might be objected to as invalid, and proclaimed Pope under the name of Urban VI. On the evening of the same day, four of the cardinals who had taken part in the conclave fled from Rome, fearing the anger of the populace, whose demand had not been acceded to. When the election of Urban was publicly announced, civil commotions were raised in the city, some going even so far as to threaten to put the new Pope to death.[4] But the people were soon pacified by the Abbot of Monte Cassino, and other influential ecclesiastics then staying in Rome. Urban was crowned on the following Easter Sunday, the cardinals who had fled having returned for the ceremony.

The election of the Archbishop of Bari would appear to have been the result of a compromise between the French

---

[1] He had been secretary to Gregory XI. before his elevation to the Archbishopric of Bari.

[2] Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismate*, i., c. 1.

[3] *Factum* of Urban, apud Raynaldum, Ad an. 1378, nn. lxxiii. *et seq.*; Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismate*, i., c. 2.

[4] Raynaldus, Ad an. 1378, n. xi.

Most probably the result of compromise between French and Italian cardinals.

and Italian Cardinals. As a subject of Joanna of Naples he was acceptable to the former, while his nationality satisfied the latter. And the compromise was much facilitated by the division of the French cardinals into two sections, as much opposed to each other as to the Italians, viz., the Limousins who had enjoyed the Tiara for the last four pontificates; and the other French cardinals[1] who were strongly opposed to the continuance of their ascendency.

His impolitic severity in dealing with cardinals and bishops.

For over four months Urban was received as lawful Pope throughout Christendom, no doubt having been raised regarding the validity of his election. Nor is there any probability that it would have been questioned, but for his severity in dealing with the cardinals. Being himself a man of very austere life, he sought to reform a number of abuses in the Papal Court. But, unfortunately, in carrying out this project, he lacked the judgment and prudence needed by the special circumstances in which he was placed. Thus, on the very day of his coronation he publicly assailed the bishops staying at Rome as perjurers because of their absence from their dioceses;[2] and in a public consistory, held on the following day, he charged some of the cardinals with being guilty of bribery and various other offences.[3] But what contributed most to alienate the cardinals, was his threat to restrict their expenditure, to allow them but one dish at table, and otherwise to curtail their privileges."[4] St. Catherine of

[1] Their leader was Robert of Geneva, afterwards Clement VII. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1378, n. ii.

[2] Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismate*, i., c. 4. Theodoric was present on the occasion.

[3] *Ibidem*, cc. 5-7.

[4] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1378, n. xxv.

Sienna, while adhering faithfully to Urban, and condemning the manner of life led by the cardinals, strongly advised the Pope to be guided in his work of reform by prudence and due regard to the strength of custom and prejudice.

Withdrawal of French cardinals to Anagni.

Influenced by the severity of the Pope's conduct towards them, as well as by his refusal[1] to go to Avignon, all the cardinals, with the exception of the four Italians, withdrew, one by one, from Rome to Anagni, where they were guarded by a band of mercenary Breton soldiers. Here they applied themselves with all earnestness to devise some means of setting his election aside as invalid. Their project, which was strongly condemned by nearly all the canonists[2] whom they consulted, was warmly taken up by the King of France. Urban used various efforts to bring back the rebellious cardinals to their allegiance; and even offered to submit the validity of his election to the decision of a General Council;[3] but all his proposals were in vain.

Their manifesto declaring Urban's election invalid (Aug. 9).

On the 9th of August, the cardinals issued a manifesto[4] to the Christian world, from Anagni, declaring that Urban's[5] election was invalid owing to the terrorism to which they had been subjected by the Romans while in conclave, and calling on Christians to refuse him their allegiance.

Towards the end of August, the cardinals removed for greater security to Fondi, in Neapolitan territory. Here

---

[1] Raynaldus, Ad. an. 1378, n. xxv.

[2] *Ibidem*, n. xxix.

[3] *Ibidem*, n. lx.

[4] *Ibidem*, n. xlviii.

[5] The cardinals declared that they had elected him merely as a matter of form, in order to get out of the difficulty in which they were placed by the Romans, believing that, as an honest man and one versed in canon law, he would afterwards freely resign.

they were joined by three of the Italian cardinals, who were deceived by the promise of election held out to each of them.[1] The aged cardinal of St. Peter's, the only one who remained faithful to Urban, died on the 7th of September. The Pope, being thus deprived of all his former advisers, created twenty-nine new cardinals, on the 18th of September, all of whom were Italians, except one Englishman. Two days later, the cardinals, at Fondi, consummated the schism, by electing cardinal Robert of Geneva,[2] who took the name of Clement VII. The new Pope, who was thirty-six years of age at the time of his election, was better known for his warlike propensities, than for his zeal as a churchman; and was chiefly recommended to the cardinals by his influential connections, being related to many of the royal families of Europe. He was immediately excommunicated by Urban; but retaliated by pronouncing a like censure against his rival.

Urban creates twenty-nine cardinals.

Election of Clement VII

Though the Church has never authoritatively decided which of the rival claimants to the Papacy was the lawful Pope, the weight of argument and authority is entirely in favour of Urban.

Urban VI. the lawful Pope.

First, his election was not the result of terrorism, as asserted by the defenders of Clement. This can be shown from the declaration of the cardinals themselves; from the account of the election handed down by Urban; and from the testimony of many independent witnesses. Thus the cardinals, in announcing the election of Urban, to their

[1] Theodoric of Niem. *De Schismate*, L. i., c, 9.

[2] All the cardinals with the exception of the three Italians voted for him.

[3] Even after his elevation to the cardinalate, he had been the leader of a band of Breton mercenaries, who committed some frightful barbarities in Italy. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1378, n. lvi.

absent brethren at Avignon, stated that[1] "at the very same hour when the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles" they had "*freely and unanimously* elected the Archbishop of Bari." Nor would Urban, as he assures us in his *Factum*,[2] consent to accept the dignity offered to him till he was assured by five cardinals that the election had been free and canonical. We are also told by St. Catherine of Sweden, who was in Rome at the time, that there was no such terrorism practised during the sitting of the conclave, as represented by the followers of Clement; and that she was assured by different cardinals that the election had been quite free.[3] And, finally, the flight of some of the cardinals from Rome, after the election, shows that they at least did not consider that the appointment of Urban was in accordance with the demand of the Romans.

(*a*) His election not the result of terrorism.

Secondly, Even though it be granted that Urban's election was invalid, the subsequent recognition of his title by the cardinals and the Church would have supplied the original defect. That his title to the Papacy was acknowledged by the cardinals, is sufficiently clear as well from their being nearly all present at his coronation—even those who had fled having returned for the ceremony—as from many of them having solicited and received numerous

(*b*) Urban acknowledged by cardinals and Christian world for months.

---

[1] The letter is given by Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an., 1378, n. xix. Many other letters, containing similar statements, were addressed by individual cardinals to the princes of Christendom.

[2] Interrogavit illos et eorum quemlibet a singulo et singillatim volens ab eis scire, an ipse revera ac sincere, pure, et libere, et canonice per omnes cardinales in conclavi fuisset electus in Papam, dixitque illis quod si electio non fuisset libera et canonica eidem electioni nullatenus consentiret; quodque ipsi quinque cardinales et eorum quilibet firmiter ac constanter responderunt, quod pro certo ipse ita sincere et pure, et libere, ac canonice electus fuit in Papam per cardinales. Apud Raynaldum, Ad an. 1378.

[3] Raynaldus, Ad an., 1379, n. xx.

favours from his hands for themselves and their friends.[1] And he was recognised as lawful Pope throughout the Christian world for over four months. For the manifesto issued by the cardinals on the 9th of August was the first intimation given to the public that could suggest any doubt about the validity of his election.

(*c*) His title defended by most Catholic writers.

Thirdly. We cannot, therefore, be surprised to find that Benedict XIV., in voicing the opinion of most Catholic writers, speaks[2] of Urban and his successors as the true vicars of Christ; and that the subsequent Clements and Benedicts ignored the Avignon Popes of those names in taking their titles.

B.—*The Continuation of the Schism.*

Most of Christendom remains true to Urban.

Most of the Christian world remained true to Urban. He was acknowledged in Germany, England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Poland, Hungary, Italy outside the Kingdom of Naples, in parts of Spain,[3] and throughout the East. Clement, who took up his residence at Avignon, was received as Pope in France, Naples, Scotland, Castile, and Aragon. An assembly of the French realm, held by Charles V. (1364-80) at Vincennes, on the 19th November, 1378, declared in favour of Clement, as he

[1] St. Catherine of Sienna thus taunts them with their inconsistency:—"Si jactent ipsos (scil. Cardinales), qui electionem celebrarunt magis quam caeteros veritatis conscios esse, retundi eorum dicta hoc responso . . . constare ipsorum dictis rite creatum Urbanum, hunc solemni pompa pontificio ornatu decorasse, huic cultum et obsequia pontificibus sacra impendisse, ab hoc sacerdotia et honores poposcisse: mendacii et idolatriae infamiam sibi ipsis aspergere, si Urbanum Pontificem negent, quem papalibus honoribus sunt prosecuti."

[2] "Depulsa temporum caligine in clara luce hodie positum est legitimum jus pontificatus penes Urbanum ejusque successores Bonifacium stetisse," etc. *De Canoniz. Sanct.*, i., c. 9, § 10.

[3] Theodoric of Niem. *De Schismate*, L, i., c. 15.

represented the interests of France; and the University of Paris, though it was at first in favour of Urban, was prevailed on by the King to take the side of his rival, in 1379. Joann[1] of Naples was led by her French blood and sympathies to take the same side. The attitude of Scotland is generally supposed to have been determined by its opposition to England, which had declared in favour of Urban. And the defection of Castile and Aragon was due to the skilful diplomacy of the Spanish cardinal, Peter de Luna.

Clement acknowledged by France, &c.

Joanna of Naples paid dearly for the transfer of her allegiance to Clement VII. Urban excommunicated her in 1380, and bestowed her kingdom, which was a fief of the Holy See, on Charles of Durazzo, who was closely related to her, and next heir[2] to the kingdom. In order to gain assistance against her rival, Joanna appointed Louis of Anjou, brother of the King of France, her heir. Her action met with the approval of Clement, who went through the form of bestowing Naples on Louis. Charles, who received liberal assistance from Urban, invaded the Kingdom of Naples, in 1381; and, after defeating Joanna's forces at San Germano, marched towards Naples, which was opened to him by the discontented inhabitants. Joanna was taken and thrown into prison, where she was put to death,[3] in 1382. But the time was not far distant when the victor of San Germano was to meet a similar fate. On the death of Louis of Hungary, in 1382, his daughter succeeded to the

Kingdom of Naples transferred to Charles of Durazzo (1380).

Murder of Joanna (1382).

---

[1] The great majority of her subjects remained true to Urban VI.

[2] Though four times married, Joanna had no children. Her first husband, who was murdered, as was generally supposed, with her connivance, was brother of Louis of Hungary, and a near relative of Charles of Durazzo.

[3] Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismate*, i. 25.

Murder of Charles (1386).

vacant crown. She resigned four years later in favour of her relative, Charles of Naples. He did not enjoy his new dignity long, for he fell, in 1386, by the dagger of an assassin, who also compelled him to take poison to hasten his death.

Urban's impolitic severity in dealing with the members of the Sacred College, involved him in various other troubles throughout his pontificate besides those arising out of the schism. We are told,[1] for instance, that on one occasion (1385) he had six cardinals arrested on the charge of conspiring against his liberty,[2] and that he caused five of them to be put to death; the sixth, who was an Englishman, being spared[3] through the interference of Richard II. And his undue attachment to his profligate nephew, Francis, usually styled Butillo, on whom he conferred the Principality of Nocera and many other honours, added to his difficulties. Compared, however, with Clement VII. who was a mere tool in the hands of the French, he showed zeal and independence in the government of the Church, and the defence of her rights and liberties.

Urban involved in various other troubles,

On the death of Urban, in 1389, Cardinal Peter Tomacelli, was elected his successor, and took the name of Boniface IX. He was about forty-five years[4] of age at the time; and though not possessing that profound knowledge of the sacred sciences that would be expected from the occupant of his exalted office, he was held in great esteem for his prudence and unblemished character.

Boniface IX. (1389-1404).

---

[1] Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismate*, i.. c. 42.

[2] St. Antoninus says (*Historia*, p. iii., tit. 23. c. 2) that they intended to depose him. Gobelin Persona († 1418) states in his *Cosmodromium* (Act. vi., c. 78), that they entered into a conspiracy to put him to death. See Rob. vii. 218.

[3] Theodoric of Niem says (i. c. 52) that the charge of conspiracy was not proved against the English cardinal.

[4] St. Antoninus says that he was only thirty-four.

Boniface made numerous efforts during his pontificate (1389-1404) to heal the schism. Immediately after his appointment he wrote to Clement, exhorting him to resign, and offering to make him legate in France and Spain, and to restore his adherents to communion with the Church. But Clement indignantly rejected these offers; whereupon the sentence of excommunication was renewed against him.

His efforts to heal the Schism.

He addressed numerous letters to Charles VI. of France (1380-1422), urging him to assist in putting an end to the schism; and for the same purpose sent a legate to the French Court, in 1392. The King consulted the university doctors on the matter. The latter suggested three plans for effecting a reunion among Christians, viz.—(*a*) the resignation of both Popes and the election of a third; (*b*) arbitration; and (*c*) a General Council. Their opinion was formulated by the Rector, Nicholas of Clemanges,[1] assisted by the Chancellor, Peter D'Ailly,[2] and forwarded (1394) to

Plans for the reunion of Christendom suggested by University of Paris.

[1] Nicholas of Clemanges, so called from the village in which he was born in the diocese of Chalons, was sent at the early age of twelve to the University of Paris. Having distinguished himself here, at first as student, and afterwards as teacher, he was appointed to the important office of rector, in 1393. Two years later he severed his connection with the University to become secretary to Benedict XIII. He withdrew from the Papal Court in 1407, and spent the rest of his life in retirement. His death occurred about the year 1440. Nicholas was a prolific writer. The best known of his works is *De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu*, though some deny that he was the author of it (see Herzog, Art. *Clemanges*). In this work, which appeared about the year 1414, the writer attacks in unsparing terms the vices prevalent among the clergy of his time, especially among the cardinals and mendicants. In his work, *De Infallibilitate Concilii Generalis*, he lays down many doctrines about the Pope and General Councils completely at variance with the teaching of Catholic faith. Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, iii., 54-56.

[2] Peter D'Ailly, sometimes styled the Eagle of France, was born of humble parents, in Compiègne, about the year 1350. By the force of genius and industry he rose to the position of Chancellor of the Paris University, in the year 1389. Having taken the side of the Avignon Popes in the dispute

Clement. The latter was so disappointed at the attitude of the Paris University towards him, as well as of most of his cardinals, who adopted the same opinion, that he died a few days later, on the 16th of September, 1394.

Benedict XIII. (1394-1424).

The Avignon cardinals proceeded to elect a successor, having previously entered into a solemn engagement that whoever should be elected would do all in his power to heal the schism, and to resign if necessary. Their choice fell on the Spanish Cardinal, Peter de Luna, who took the name of Benedict XIII. (1394-1424). Benedict's subsequent conduct was strangely at variance with the anxiety he manifested before his election for the reunion of Christendom. He left no means untried to defeat the efforts of those who were labouring in the interests of peace. And even after the Council of Constance, when he was deserted by all except a few fanatical followers, he obstinately continued to maintain his pretensions down to his death.

He opposes a reunion of Christendom.

A Council held at Paris (1395) recommends the resignation of the two Popes.

The University of Paris took a leading part in every movement that had for its aim the reunion of Christendom. This was particularly true of its two most distinguished members, Peter D'Ailly and Gerson,[1] whose names figure

---

then raging, he was appointed Bishop of Cambray by Benedict XIII. in 1396. Having transferred his allegiance in 1409 to the new Pope, Alexander V. appointed at the Council of Pisa, he was created cardinal in the following year by John XXIII., Alexander's successor. He laboured indefatigably for the reunion of Christendom, and had the happiness of seeing his long-cherished desire satisfied before his death (1425).

He is the author of numerous treatises on theology, canon law, and Church discipline, the best known of his works being *De Reformatione Ecclesiae*, in which he advocated a thorough reformation of the Church in her head and members, and suggested the means by which that end was to be attained.

John Charlier, usually called Gerson, from a village of that name in

so prominently in the history of this period. It is generally supposed that they were chiefly responsible for the decision arrived at by a numerously attended Council held at Paris in 1395, which recommended the resignation of the two Popes, and the election of a third as the most effective means of healing the schism. The announcement of the decision was most disappointing to Benedict. He said that the action of the Council was derogatory to the Papal dignity, and refused to resign ; but expressed his readiness to hold a conference with Boniface for the purpose of healing the schism.

Another national Council was held at Paris, in 1398, at which it was resolved to withdraw from allegiance to Benedict till he should consent to resign. The resolution of the Council was approved by the King. When Benedict learned the conclusion arrived at by the French clergy, he declared that no consideration would induce him to resign a dignity conferred on him by God. Neither Pope was acknowledged in France from 1308 to 1403, when another Council was held at Paris, at which it was resolved that the French people should return to their former allegiance,

France withdraws from allegiance to Benedict (1398).

Its return to former allegiance (1403).

---

the diocese of Rheims, where he was born, was educated in the University of Paris, and succeeded Peter D'Ailly as Chancellor, in 1396. He retained this office till the Council of Constance, at which he attended, and laboured energetically to heal the schism. He was chiefly instrumental in having the teaching of a French theologian, named John Petit, condemned, who maintained that it was lawful to kill a tyrant; and thereby aroused the bitter enmity of the Duke of Burgundy, whose murder of the Duke of Orleans, in 1407, Petit sought to justify. Fearing, therefore, to return to Paris, which was at the time in the hands of the English and the Duke of Burgundy, he sought refuge in Germany. After the assassination of his enemy, in 1419, he went to Lyons, where he spent the last years of his life, and died, in 1427, at the age of sixty-six.

as no other nation showed any willingness to follow their example.

Europe threatened by Saracens under Bajazet I.

About this time the safety of Christian Europe was threatened by the Saracens, led by Bajazet I., one of the most renowned of Mohammed's successors. Having conquered Bulgaria and Servia, he invaded Hungary in 1395. Elated with the pride of victory, which had hitherto attended his arms, he boasted that he would soon establish his supremacy over Germany and Italy, and feed his horse with oats on the altar of St. Peter's. This boast of the Mussulman leader aroused the indignation of France and Germany, from each of which soldiers were despatched to the assistance of Sigismund of Hungary. The confederate army of the Christians, to the number of 100,000 men, was completely routed by the Turks at the battle of Nicopolis, in 1396.

Defeat of the Christians at Nicopolis (1396).

Bajazet defeated and taken prisoner by Tamerlane (1402).[1]

Europe was too much divided at the time to offer any effective resistance to the onward march of Bajazet. He might have fulfilled his boast had he not been shortly afterwards obliged to return to Asia Minor to defend his possessions against the great Mongolian conqueror, Tamerlane († 1405). The armies of the Mohammedan rivals met on the plains of Angora in 1402. Bajazet's followers were completely routed, and himself taken prisoner. He spent the remainder of his days in confinement; and finally, after being subjected to various indignities by Tamerlane, ended his life by dashing his head against the iron cage in which he was imprisoned.[1]

---

[1] The story of the iron cage is rejected by Gibbon (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv. 297), who says that Tamerlane treated his royal captive with all the consideration due to his rank.

Innocent VII. (1404-6).

On the death of Boniface, in 1404, the cardinals, before proceeding to elect a successor, entered into an engagement that whoever should be elected would do all in his power to heal the schism, and would even resign if Benedict would do likewise.[1] Their choice fell on Cosmato Migliorati, Cardinal of the Holy Cross, who took the name of Innocent VII.

Convokes a General Council.

Immediately after his elevation, the new Pope showed his determination to carry out his promise by summoning a General Council to meet at Rome on the 1st of November, 1405. Unfortunately, however, the proposed council could not be held owing to the disturbances caused in Rome by Ladislaus of Naples (1387-1414), who sought to prevent a reunion of Christendom, as he feared that his title to Naples, which was based on the grant made by Urban VI. to his father, Charles of Durazzo, might not be admitted. The Pope was forced to withdraw to Viterbo, in August, 1405. He pronounced sentence of excommunication against the faithless Ladislaus, and declared him deposed from the throne of Naples. The death of Innocent in the following year, after a brief pontificate of two years, prevented him from giving effect to his desire of restoring peace to Christendom.

Council not held owing to opposition of King of Naples.

Gregory XII. (1406-15).

Before electing a successor, the cardinals bound themselves by a solemn engagement, similar to that entered into before the election of Innocent. The choice of the conclave was Angelo Corario, Cardinal-priest of St. Mark's, who was recommended by his piety, prudence, and learning.[2] The new Pope, who took the name of Gregory XII.,

[1] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1406, n. x.

[2] St. Antoninus *Sum. Hist.*, P. iii., tit. xxii. Theodoric of Niem describes him (*De Schismate*, iii., c. 6) as "a consummate hypocrite."

wrote immediately after his elevation to Benedict XIII. urging him to resign, and offering to make honourable provision for himself and his cardinals. Benedict replied by proposing that they should hold a conference, to which Gregory agreed. Savona, a town on the Gulf of Genoa, was fixed on as the place where they were to meet in October, 1407. On considering the matter more fully, Gregory refused to go to Savona, which was in French territory, fearing that he might be placed under arrest; but suggested that the proposed meeting should take place in some town in the Papal States, where they would be free from all external interference. To this new proposal Benedict refused to agree; and thus all hope of a reunion of Christendom through the Popes disappeared.

The negotiations between him and Benedict fall through.

The feeling was daily growing stronger that the rival Popes were merely trifling with the patience of Christendom, and that they had no intention whatever of resigning. Hence we find that it was resolved at an assembly of the French nation, held at Paris, in 1407, to take the matter out of their hands, and refer it for settlement to a General Council. The course recommended by the French Assembly found general acceptance throughout the Christian world as the only means of healing the schism.

Decision of the French Assembly (1407).

The Council of Pisa 1409).

At length most of the cardinals, of both obediences, acting on the clearly expressed wish of Christendom, met at Leghorn in the month of July, 1408, and convoked a General Council to meet at Pisa in the following March. Letters of invitation were sent to Gregory and Benedict. The former replied by excommunicating the cardinals, and

Its convocation (1408).

expressing his intention of holding a Council[1] of his own. Benedict's reply was to the same effect.[2]

The Council opened at Pisa on the 25th of March, 1409, under the presidency of Guy of Maillesec, Cardinal-Bishop of Palestrina. There were present twenty-two cardinals, four patriarchs, one hundred and eighty-two bishops, either personally or by proxy, three hundred abbots, four hundred doctors and representatives of chapters, and ambassadors from nearly all Christian kings and princes.

Number of bishops, &c., present.

The great subject that absorbed the attention of the fathers was the termination of the schism. In the course which they adopted they were mainly guided by two books recently written by Gerson,[3] viz., *De Unitate Ecclesiae* and *De Auferibilitate Papae ab Ecclesia*, in which the writer maintained that in the case of a doubtful Pope the cardinals, as representing the Church, could convoke a General Council, and that such Council was fully empowered to issue dogmatic and disciplinary decrees binding on all Christians, and to depose all doubtful claimants to the Papacy. His teaching was eloquently defended by Peter D'Ailly, who was present. Unfortunately, the principles laid down by Gerson and Peter D'Ailly, which were intended to apply merely to the condition of things then existing, were afterwards extended by the theologians of the Gallican school, to determine the relations between an undoubted Pope and a General Council.

The Council guided by the teaching of Gerson.

---

[1] The proposed Council was held about Pentecost, 1409, at Cividale. The majority of the few bishops present were in favour of Gregory resigning.

[2] Benedict, who had taken refuge in Aragon, held a Council at Perpignan, towards the end of 1408. There were at first one hundred and twenty bishops present; but they all soon left except eighteen, who advised Benedict to resign.

[3] He was not present at the Council.

Deposition of Gregory and Benedict.

Gregory and Benedict received each a triple citation to attend at the Council. On their refusing to obey they were condemned as contumacious in the third Session. Various charges were then brought against them. Having been declared guilty in the fifteenth Session, they were cut off from the Church as obstinate schismatics and notorious heretics, and Christians were forbidden to yield allegiance to them. The sentence was pronounced in the name of the Council by the titular Patriarch of Alexandria.

Election o Alexander V.

The next question that occupied the attention of the Council was the appointment of one to fill the see thus declared vacant. On the fifteenth of June twenty-four cardinals entered into conclave, and after eleven days elected the learned Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, who took the name of Alexander V.

No disciplinary decrees passed.

A letter was addressed to the new Pope by Gerson, strongly urging him to undertake the work of reform before dissolving the Council. But owing to the refusal of Gregory and Benedict to resign, it was generally deemed useless to pass disciplinary decrees, which might be easily rejected as not binding by those who did not wish to obey them. Alexander, therefore, dissolved the Council in the twenty-third Session; promising, however, to convene another Council within three years to proceed with the much-needed work of reform.[1]

[1] The Council does not appear to have any claim to be considered ecumenical, as it was not convoked, nor presided over, nor approved by a Pope, though many Gallican writers, such as Natalis Alexander, and Bossuet, maintain the opposite opinion. Bellarmine speaks of it as a "a General Council neither approved nor condemned.' (*De Conc.*, i. c. 8.) Most writers, however, while admitting that the Council was not ecumenical, hold that it was a constitutional assembly, because in the case of a dispute about the Papacy no candidate can be considered the undoubted Pope; and, therefore, the cardinals are entitled to convoke a Council to restore peace to Christendom.

Christendom divided into three obediences.

The Council of Pisa had but the effect of increasing the evil it was intended to remove. The Christian world had been previously divided into two obediences; now it was divided into three. The kingdom of Naples, most of Italy, and parts of Germany, adhered to Gregory XII.; Spain Portugal, and Scotland remained true to Benedict XIII.: while the rest of Christendom acknowledged the new Pope. During his brief pontificate, Alexander fell under the sway of Baltazzar Cossa, Cardinal-Legate of Bologna; and was very liberal in the granting of privileges, especially to the Franciscan Order, of which he had been formerly a member.

John XXIII. (1410-15).

On the death of Alexander (1410), Baltazzar Cossa was appointed his successor, under the name of John XXIII.[1] His character is painted in rather dark colours by most contemporary writers, especially by Theodoric of Niem.[2] St. Antoninus speaks[3] of him as one more suited for some position in the world than for the exalted office which he held. And Gobelin says[4] that many were scandalized at his appointment because of his past wickedness.

Holds a Council at Rome (1412).

In accordance with the promise made by his predecessor at the Council of Pisa, John held a Council at Rome, in 1412.[5] But owing to the small number of bishops who attended, and the Pope's own apathy in the work of reform, the Council came to an end without doing anything except condemn the writings of Wicliffe.

---

[1] He was the last Pope who took the name of John.

[2] *Vita Joannis XXIII.*

[3] *Sum. Hist.*, p. iii. tit. 22, c. 6.

[4] *Cosm. Aet.*, vi., c. 90.

[5] Some writers say that it did not meet till February, 1413. Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1412, n. v., note by Mansi.

C.—*The Termination of the Schism.*

The Council of Constance (1414-18).

The time at length arrived when the schism which had distracted the Church so long was to be healed. Yielding to the urgent appeal of Sigismund of Hungary, recently elected emperor (1410-37), John promised to convoke a General Council. At an interview held between them at Lodi, towards the end of 1413, Constance was fixed on as the place of meeting. Both John and Sigismund immediately addressed letters[1] to the bishops and princes of Christendom, summoning them to attend at Constance on the 1st of November, 1414. The Pope spoke of the future Council as a continuation of that of Pisa, with the obvious intention of thereby rendering his claims to the Papacy the more secure, as no assembly would be likely to condemn its own action.[2] Letters of invitation were also forwarded to Gregory and Benedict; but they refused to attend. The former, however, sent a legate to represent his interests.

Held for a triple purpose.

The Council was solemnly opened by John XXIII., on the 5th of November. At the first General Session, held on the 16th of the same month, the Bull of Convocation was read;[3] and the objects for which the fathers had been called together explained, viz., to terminate the schism, to condemn errors against faith, and to pass reformatory decrees.

Never before were all classes of Christendom, both lay and cleric, so well represented as they were at Constance. When the number was largest there were present eighteen

---

[1] Palatius, *Gesta. Pont. Rom.* (Venice, 1688), iii. 453.

[2] Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 295.

[3] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, viii, 231.

thousand ecclesiastics, among them being three patriarchs, twenty-nine cardinals, one hundred and fifty bishops, about the same number of abbots and generals of religious orders, and three hundred doctors. And the laity were represented by the emperor and ambassadors from every Christian prince in Europe. We are told[1] that there were usually fifty thousand strangers in the city during the sittings of the Council, and sometimes double that number.

Large number o ecclesiastics and laymen present.

Before the Council could undertake the work proper for which it met, some preliminary questions of procedure had to be determined. In the first place it was decided, after considerable dispute, to extend the right of voting, which had been confined by the traditional usage of the Church to bishops and mitred abbots, to doctors,[2] representatives of chapters, and Christian princes or their ambassadors. For, as Cardinals D'Ailly and Fillastre argued, all Christians had a deep interest in the chief question that was to occupy the attention of the Council, viz., the termination of the schism. And, secondly, it was settled that those having a right to vote should be divided into nations, each of which was to have but one vote, to be determined by the majority of its representatives. At first there were only four nations, viz., the Italian, the French, the German,[3] and the English; but the number was increased to five, in 1417, by the addition of the Spanish. Each nation was

Questions of procedure determined.

---

[1] Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, x. 392; Mansi, *Coll. Conc.*, xxviii. 625.

[2] They had been accorded the right of voting at the Councils of Pisa (1409) and Rome (1412).

[3] The German nation included the Poles, as the English did the Irish and the Scotch. The cardinals claimed that they should have the right to an independent vote as they were as numerous as the representatives of the English nation; but their claim was disallowed.

to have its own deliberations. The decision of the majority was to be brought before a general congregation of the nations, the final result being published at the next General Session. These two important changes regarding the right and manner of voting were adopted in order to destroy the preponderating influence which John would otherwise have at the Council owing to the large number of Italian bishops and abbots present.

General opinion of the fathers regarding the best way of healing the schism.

The general opinion of the Council about the most effective means of healing the schism was voiced by Cardinal Fillastre in a letter published by him on the 15th of February, 1415, advocating the resignation of the three Popes. This opinion was strengthened by a pamphlet which appeared a few days later containing a number of the most damaging charges against John's character. These charges aroused such a storm of opposition, that, feeling he had no alternative but submit to the wish of the Council, he promised on oath, at the Second General Session, held on the 2nd of March, to resign if Gregory and Benedict would also consent to resign. Five days later he issued a Bull confirming his previous promise.

Flight of John from Constance (1415).

Unwilling to remain any longer at an assembly with which he had been completely discredited, he fled from Constance, on the 21st of March, disguised as a groom. He was assisted in making his escape by Frederick, Duke of Austria and Count of Tyrol, with whom he had entered into a secret covenant on his way to Constance. He took refuge in Schaffhausen, within the Duke's dominions, from which he addressed a letter to the Council explaining the reasons of his flight, and expressing his willingness to adhere to his promise of resigning.

Two days after John's departure from Constance, Gerson delivered a discourse on the relations between a Pope and a General Council, which had a powerful effect in calming the fears entertained by many that the Pope's recent action would imperil the efficiency of the Council. In his address he laid down the principles already set forth in his work *De Auferibilitate Papae ab Ecclesia*, and afterwards embodied in the decrees of the third, fourth, and fifth General Sessions.

Gerson addresses the Council.

At the third General Session, held on the 26th March, under the presidency of Cardinal D'Ailly, the only other cardinal present being Zabarella, it was decreed that the Council, which had been legitimately convened, retained its authority after John's departure, and that it could not be transferred or dissolved without its consent. The fathers went further in the fourth and fifth Sessions, held on the 30th of March and 5th of April, when they declared that the Council was ecumenical, fully representing the Church; that it had its authority immediately from God; and that all Christians, without exception, even the Pope, were bound by its decrees in so far as they regarded the healing of the schism, matters of faith, and the reformation of the Church in her head and members.[1]

Decrees of the third, fourth, and fifth Sessions.

[1] The following are the decrees of the fourth and fifth Sessions as given by Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, viii. 252-58:—

"Haec sancta synodus Constantiensis generale concilium faciens, pro extirpatione praesentis schismatis et unione ac reformatione Ecclesiae Dei in capite et membris facienda, ad laudem omnipotentis Dei, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, ad consequendam facilius, securius, liberius, et uberius unionem et reformationem Ecclesiae Dei, ordinat, definit, statuit, decernit, et declarat, ut sequitur.

"Et primo declarat quod ipsa synodus in Spiritu Sancto congregata legitime, generale concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem representans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscumque

John accused of different charges.

The Council was engaged in proceeding against John from the sixth to the twelfth Session, with the exception of the eighth, in which the errors of Wicliffe and Huss were condemned. Various charges[1] were brought against him under seventy-two heads. The fugitive Pope, having been taken captive by Frederick of Austria,[2] who had been

---

status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quae pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem schismatis et reformationem generalem Ecclesiae Dei in capite et membris.

"Item declarat quod quicumque cujuscumque conditionis, status, dignitatis, etiamsi papalis, qui mandatis, statutis seu ordinationibus, aut praeceptis hujus sacrae synodi, et cujuscumque alterius concilii generalis legitime congregati super praemissis, seu ad ea pertinentibus, factis, vel faciendis, odedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignae poenitentiae subjiciatur, et debite puniatur, etiam ad alia juris subsidia (si opus fuerit) recurrendo."

The interpretation of these decrees has given rise to considerable controversy. Gallican writers maintain—(*a*) that they were intended to define the general relations between a Pope and an Ecumenical Council; and (*b*) that they were the decrees of a General Council. Hefele and others agree with the writers mentioned regarding the aim of the decrees; but deny that they were the enactments of a General Council, as they never received the approval of the Holy See. The majority of Catholic historians, however, such as Palma, Jungmann, &c., maintain that the fathers of Constance in enacting these decrees intended merely to meet a passing emergency and to define the relations between a General Council and a doubtful Pope. In support of their opinion they appeal—(*a*) to the scope of the Council as set forth in the introduction to the decrees (*pro extirpatione praesentis schismatis*); (*b*) to the reason which determined the fathers at the fortieth Session to elect a Pope before enacting disciplinary decrees, "because a future Pope could not be bound" by their legislation; and (*c*) to the decision of twenty-eight out of forty doctors who gave their opinion that errors against faith should be condemned in the name of the Pope and Council, and not, as some maintained, in the name of the Council alone.

[1] He was charged, for instance, with having poisoned his predecessor, and having secured his election by simony. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1410, n. xvii.

[2] He had been placed under the ban of the empire by Sigismund; and was thus compelled to sue for pardon, which was granted on his undertaking to bring John back to Constance.

chiefly instrumental in securing his escape and brought back to Radolfzell, near Constance, refused to defend himself against the charges alleged against him, and expressed his readiness to abide by the decision of the Council. At length John[1] was declared guilty in the twelfth Session, and deposed; and it was decreed that neither he nor any of the rival Popes would be eligible for re-election.

His deposition. (May 29th, 1415)

When Gregory learned that John had been deposed, he immediately resolved to resign. He sent Charles Malatesta, Lord of Rimini, to Constance, with authority to have the Council lawfully convoked in his name, and to forthwith tender his resignation. In accordance with Gregory's instructions, the Council was again convoked at the fourteenth Session (July 4), after which his[2] resignation was accepted.

Gregory's resignation tendered and accepted (July 4th).

Sigismund immediately set out for Spain accompanied by some representatives of the Council, to secure the resignation of the third claimant to the Papacy; but Benedict obstinately refused to yield. The Spanish sovereigns, influenced by the Emperor and St. Vincent Ferrer,[3]

Sigismund seeks to bring about the resignation of Benedict.

---

[1] After being kept in confinement for some time, he was appointed Cardinal-Bishop of Frascati by Martin V. But he died a few months afterwards at Florence without coming into possession of his see.

[2] He was appointed Cardinal-Legate of Ancona, but did not survive his appointment long, for he passed to his reward in October, 1417.

[3] He was born at Valencia, in Spain, in 1357. At the age of eighteen he joined the Dominicans in his native town. He soon acquired a high reputation for piety and learning. He practised the most extreme austerities, and lectured with great applause in different universities of Spain. But it was as a preacher that he was most famous. After visiting almost every part of his native country, he crossed the Pyrenees, in 1398, and preached with wonderful success throughout France, Italy, and the Rhenish provinces of Germany. So great was his fame, that he was asked by Henry IV. of

Benedict's deposition (1417) and death (1424).

the Thaumaturgus of his age, withdrew from his allegiance, and promised to send representatives to the Council of Constance. Milder measures having failed to bring about Benedict's resignation, it only remained for the Council to deal with him in another way. The usual canonical citations having been issued to him to appear at Constance, the sentence of deposition was pronounced against him in the thirty-seventh Session (July 26, 1417). The obstinate old man, regardless of the sentence of the Council and the feelings of Christendom, shut himself in the rocky fortress of Peñiscola, where he held out against all offers of reconciliation with the Church until his death (1424).

Election of Martin V. by Cardinals and representatives of nations.

The three claimants to the Papacy having been thus disposed of, a discussion arose among the fathers as to whether the election of a Pope or the enactment of disciplinary measures should take precedence. It was decided, in the fortieth Session, to proceed immediately with the election of a Pope, both in the interests of unity and because the decrees of an acephalous Council might be rejected as not binding. It was also arranged, on account of the special circumstances of the case, that each nation should have a voice in the election of the new Pope.

England to preach to his subjects. In compliance with the King's request he visted, we are told, most of the towns of England, Ireland, and Scotland. It was generally believed that he had the gift of tongues (Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1403).

During the great Western Schism, he took the side of Clement VII. This did not, however, interfere in the slightest with the warmth of the reception accorded to him by the followers of the rival Popes wherever he went. He was appointed master of the palace at Avignon, by Benedict XIII., to whom he adhered till the Council of Constance, when, on Benedict's refusal to resign, he withdrew his allegiance, and advised the Spanish sovereigns to do likewise. He passed to his reward at Vannes, in the year 1419, and was placed on the calendar of the saints by Calixtus III., in 1455.

Twenty-three cardinals and thirty ecclesiastical representatives of the five nations entered into conclave[1] on the 8th of November, 1417; and, three days later, elected Cardinal Otho Colonna, who was distinguished alike for his piety and learning. The newly-elected Pope, who was only in sub-deacon's orders, after receiving deaconship and priesthood, was consecrated Bishop of Rome under the name of Martin V. He was immediately recognised as the lawful Pope, and presided at the forty-second and remaining Sessions of the Council.

Difficulty of enacting reformatory measures.

The fathers, having put an end to the schism, turned their attention to the question of reform. But it was soon found that on this subject, a great diversity of opinion prevailed among them. Each class represented at the Council sought to have reformatory decrees passed that would not touch themselves; while the large majority appeared anxious to restrict the Pope's authority in the government of the Church. After much discussion, it was finally arranged that the Council should legislate on those subjects on which there was a general agreement; and that on other matters concordats should be entered into between the Holy See and the different nations.

In the forty-fifth and last Session, which was held on the 22nd of April, 1418, Martin V. confirmed[2] "the decrees

[1] A majority of two-thirds of the votes was required. Palatius, *Gesta Pontificum Romanorum*, iii. 469.

[2] The Pope had previously issued a Bull confirming certain enactments of the Council; but the Bull has not come down to us. We are, therefore, left to infer its tenor from the words used by Martin in confirming the decrees of the fathers of Constance at the forty-fifth Session, as recorded in the Acts of the Council. The occasion of the second confirmation was the request of the Poles, that a book written by a Dominican named John of Falkenberg, in which John Petit's doctrine about tyrannicide was defended, should be

Decrees of the Council confirmed in 45th and last Session (1418).

passed *constitutionally regarding matters of faith;*" thereby, excluding the "Synodal Constitutions" of the third, fourth, and fifth Sessions, which were neither enacted constitutionally nor regarded as decrees on matters of faith.

Martin resides at Florence (1418-20).

The Pope returned to Italy after the termination of the Council. Rome being at the time in the hands of the Neapolitans, he was obliged to take up his residence at Florence. After remaining here for two years he got possession of the Eternal City, in 1420, with the assistance of the Florentines. He found that disorder reigned throughout the Papal States, and that the churches and other public buildings of Rome were in a most dilapi-

---

condemned. The book had been condemned by a general assembly of the nations: but the condemnation was never promulgated in a General Session, and was not, therefore, included in the enactments of the Council confirmed by the Pope.

Martin's confirmation, as handed down in the Acts of the Council, is thus given by Harduin (*Coll. Conc.*, viii. 902): "Sanctissimus Dominus noster . . . dixit quod omnia et singula determinata et conclusa et decreta *in materiis fidei* per praesens concilium *conciliariter* tenere et inviolabiter observare volebat et numquam contravenire quoquo modo . . . *Ipsaque sic conciliariter facta approbat et ratificat et non aliter nec alio ullo modo.*"

From these words it is clear that Martin V. excluded from the confirmation of the Council the condemnation of the book of John of Falkenberg, and the decrees of the third, fourth, and fifth Sessions. That the latter were not included, is obvious for many reasons.

(*a*) They were not looked on by the fathers of Constance as doctrinal definitions, for they are styled "*capitula quaedam per modum constitutionum, synodalium.*" And even after they had been passed, those who opposed them were not treated as holding heretical opinions.

(*b*) They were not *conciliar enactments* – at least in the sense understood by the Pope. For they were passed against the protests of the cardinals. There were, indeed, eight cardinals present at the fifth Session, but we are told that they attended, though opposed to the action of the Council, merely to avoid scandal. It was the opinion of the cardinals, as expressed by Cardinal D'Ailly, in a work written during the sitting of the Council, that the opposition of the cardinals to any measure would be fatal, as the Council, without

dated condition, owing to the continued absence of the Popes. "The vigour and justice of his administration soon restored order and security, such as had been long unknown in the surrounding territory; and his subjects in general, feeling the benefits which they owed him, regarded him with reverence and affection, which expressed themselves in styling him the third founder of the city;"[1] while the zeal shown by him in restoring and decorating churches had a wonderful effect in stimulating bishops and priests throughout Christendom to follow his example in caring for the beauty of God's house.

He restores order in the Papal States.

---

the cardinals, could not be considered ecumenical. We cannot, therefore, suppose that Martin V., who was himself a cardinal at the time, would afterwards as Pope confirm what were looked on as unconstitutional enactments.

(*e*) The Pope, just at the time that he confirmed the enactments of the Council, condemned appeals from his decision to a future General Council, showing thereby that he did not admit the decrees of the fourth and fifth Sessions of the Council of Constance as understood by Gallican writers; and, that, consequently, he did not wish to include these decrees in his confirmation of the Council. See Palma, *Præl. in Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 27-53; and Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 308-325.

[1] Rob. viii. 4.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE COUNCILS OF BASLE AND FLORENCE.

A.—*The Council of Basle.*

Council of Pavia (1423).

AT the forty-fourth Session of the Council of Constance Martin V. convoked another General Council to meet at Pavia, in 1423,[1] to proceed with the work of reform. On the approach of the time fixed for holding the Council the Pope sent legates to preside in his name. It was opened on the 23rd April; but, owing to the small number of bishops in attendance, as well as to the breaking out of a contagious disease at Pavia, it was transferred, after two months, to Sienna. As very few bishops still put in an appearance, it was deemed useless to continue the Council. So it was dissolved on the 7th of March, 1424, without having done anything except renew the condemnation of the antipope Benedict XIII., and of the errors of Wicliffe and Huss.

Transferred to Sienna.

[1] The two chief authorities on the history of the Council of Basle are Aeneas Silvius, afterwards Pius II., and Augustinus Patricius, a Canon of Sienna, both of whom were present at its deliberations. The former wrote his *Commentariorum de Gestis Concilii Basilcensis Libri ii.*, in 1444, giving its history for the years 1438-40; and the latter compiled his *Summa Conciliorum Basileensis, Florentini*, &c., from the memoirs of the Council which he found at Basle, and from other sources. The work of Augustinus is published by Harduin in his *Collectio Conciliorum*, vol. ix., p. 1081, &c.

[2] This was in accordance with a decree passed at the thirty-ninth Session of the same Council that the next General Council should be held within five years, another after seven years, and afterwards at regular intervals of ten years. Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, viii. 895.

In the Bull issued by Martin dissolving the Council of Sienna, he convoked another Council to meet at Basle at the end of seven years. Early in the year 1431 he sent Cardinal Julian Cesarini as his legate to Basle, to preside at the deliberations of the fathers. But before the time arrived for opening the Council, Martin died (February 21), and was succeeded by Cardinal Gabriel of St. Clement, who took the name of Eugene IV. The new Pope, after some hesitation, confirmed Cardinal Julian in the position of president of the Council, to which he had been already appointed.

Convocation of Council of Basle.

Eugene IV. (1431-47).

On his arrival at Basle, in March, the time fixed for opening the Council, Cardinal Julian found that the Abbot of Vezelay was the only ecclesiastic who had put in an appearance. Having addressed letters to bishops and other ecclesiastics, urging them to attend the Council, he set out for Bohemia, hoping to effect a reconciliation between the Hussites and the Church. As he was detained here longer than he expected, he appointed two doctors, named John Polemar, auditor of the Sacred Palace, and John of Ragusa, Procurator-General of the Dominicans, to represent him at Basle. They declared the Council opened on the 23rd of July,[1] though there were present only the Abbot of Vezelay, two representatives of the Paris University, and the local clergy.

Arrival of Julian Cesarini at Basle.

The Council opens (July 23rd 1431).

On Cardinal Julian's return to Basle, on the 9th of September, he found that only three bishops and seven abbots had yet arrived. He again addressed letters to the bishops and princes of Christendom, urging them to come to the Council or send representatives. Having waited in

Small number of ecclesiastics present at the Council.

[1] Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, viii., 1103

vain for two months expecting additional arrivals, he despatched messengers to inform the Pope of the small number of fathers who had come to Basle, owing to its proximity to the scene of war between the Dukes of Burgundy and Austria. The Pope replied in a letter, dated the 12th of November, authorizing Cardinal Julian to dissolve the Council, and convoke another, to open a year and a-half later at Bologna. In selecting this city he was chiefly influenced by the desire to meet the convenience of the Greeks, who had promised to attend the Council.

Julian Cesarini authorized to dissolve it.

Before the Pope's letter reached Cardinal Julian, the number of ecclesiastics at Basle had considerably increased. The legate, considering that the reason for dissolving the Council had thereby ceased, resolved to continue it, especially as the Hussites had accepted the invitation recently issued to them to attend. He wrote to the Pope, informing him of the course he was adopting, and stating that the dissolution of the Council in the circumstances would be ascribed to the fear of Catholic theologians to meet their Hussite opponents. Without waiting for the Pope's reply, he held the first Public Session on the 14th of December, there being present fourteen prelates and a large number of ecclesiastics of inferior dignity. A decree was issued declaring that the Council had been canonically convoked with the authority of the Holy See; and that, therefore, all who had been summoned were bound to attend.

The council continued.

First Public Session (Dec. 14).

To expedite the work of the Council, the fathers divided themselves into four committees, each consisting of an equal number of bishops, doctors, and other ecclesiastics. Of these, the first was to deal with general business; the second, with questions of reform; the third, with matters

Four Committees appointed by the Council.

of faith; and the fourth with the reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches. Every subject that was to occupy the attention of the fathers was to be first fully discussed by one of the committees, after which it was to be brought before a general congregation of the Council, and, if adopted by the latter, it was to be formulated into a canon or decree, and published at the next General Session.

Eugene issues a Bull dissolving the Council (Dec. 18th).

Before Cardinal Julian's letter, announcing his intention to continue the Council, reached Rome, Eugene had learned from other sources that the Hussites had been invited by the Basilians, in violation of the traditional usage of the Church, to discuss errors already solemnly condemned by the Councils of Constance and Sienna. The Pope, therefore, immediately issued a Bull (December 18) dissolving the Council of Basle, and convoking another, to meet at Bologna a year and a half later, at which he promised to attend.

Opposition of the Basilians to the Papacy.

The news of the dissolution of the Council caused much indignation at Basle. The fathers wrote to Eugene, demanding the withdrawal of the Bull. Without waiting for a reply to their communication, they addressed letters to the bishops of Christendom, inviting them to the Council, which had been lawfully convoked; and thus commenced their policy of opposition to the Papacy. In adopting this course they were chiefly influenced by Cardinal Capranica,[1] a personal enemy of Eugene. They found an able

[1] He had been created cardinal by Martin V. But as his elevation had not been publicly announced, he was not admitted to the conclave on Martin's death. Nor did Eugene afterwards consent to recognise his status as cardinal.

defender of their conduct in Nicholas of Cusa,[1] the learned Dean of St. Florin's, at Coblentz, who was present at the Council. The authority, however, of the Holy See was fully vindicated against the attacks of its enemies by the distinguished Spanish Dominican, John of Turrecremata, who was also present, in his well-known work, *De Potestate Papae et Concilii Generalis.*

Appeal of Julian Cesarini and Sigismund to Eugene to continue the Council.

Cardinal Julian and the Emperor also addressed letters to Eugene, strongly urging the continuation of the Council. They explained that the Hussites had not been invited to discuss defined doctrines, as being in any way doubtful, but merely to give them an opportunity of having the truths of faith put properly before them. The Emperor had a special interest in the success of the Council, as he had recently become King of Bohemia, and expected that the wars that distracted that country would be terminated by the reconciliation of the Hussites with the Church.

The Pope allows the fathers to deal with the Hussites.

Influenced by these representations, Eugene consented to the fathers of Basle continuing their labours; but limited their authority to the question of the Hussites. This concession was indignantly rejected by the Basilians, who henceforth "manifested a desire not only to triumph

[1] Nicholas Krebs, usually called Nicholas of Cusa, from a town of that name situated on the Moselle, where he was born, in 1401, is described by Aeneas Silvius, the historian of the Council, as one of the most learned and generally accomplished scholars of his age (*De Gest. Conc. Basil.*, c. 3). In defence of the course adopted by the fathers of Basle, he wrote his work, *De Concordantia Catholica*, in which he propounds and amplifies the principles laid down by Gerson and others regarding the superiority of a General Council to a Pope. Being shortly afterwards disgusted with the arrogance of the Basilians, he took the side of Eugene, and was created cardinal in 1448. He died at Lodi, in Italy, in 1464.

over Eugene personally, but to humble the Holy See."[1] In the second General Session,[2] held on the 15th of February, 1432, though there were only seven bishops present, they renewed and amplified the decrees of the fourth and fifth Sessions of Constance, defining that a General Council was superior to a Pope. In the third (April 29), they renewed the decrees of the previous Session, and summoned the Pope and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months, either personally or through their representatives. In the fourth, they drew up rules for the election of a new Pope, in case Eugene should die during the sitting of the Council; and even went so far as to appoint a governor of Avignon which belonged to the Holy See. The Basilians were engaged during the remaining Sessions, up to the fifteenth, in citing Eugene to appear at the Council, and passing decrees derogatory to his authority.

The Decrees of Constance against the Holy See renewed.

Yielding at length to the entreaties of Sigismund, Charles VII. of France, the French clergy, and some of the cardinals, who threatened to desert him, Eugene issued a Bull, on the 15th of December, 1433, revoking the previous Bull of dissolution, and recognising the authority of the Council to deal with questions of faith and morals.[3] The

The Bull of Dissolution revoked by Eugene (Dec. 15th, 1433).

---

[1] Rob., viii. 63.

[2] Cardinal Julian refused to preside at this or the following Sessions till the seventh, when he resumed the presidency of the Council at the urgent request of the fathers.

[3] Hence it has been inferred by some writers of the Gallican school that the Pope approved of the decrees of the second and third Sessions. How groundless is this inference, will appear from the following words of a Bull, issued a short time previously, on the 1st of August, 1433:—"Volumus et contentamur, praefatum concilium generale Basileense a tempore inchoationis suae continuatum fuisse et esse, et prosecutionemque ad praedicta debere,

new Bull was read at the sixteenth Session (February 4, 1434); and in the following Session, at which four legates, sent by Eugene, presided, everything said or done against the authority of the Holy See was recalled. Thus was peace restored for the present between Eugene and the Basilians.

Temporary reconciliation between Eugene and the Basilians.

After the recognition of the Council by the Pope, the number of ecclesiastics in attendance rapidly increased, though at no time were there many bishops present. Unfortunately, however, for the success of their labours, the professions of respect for the authority of the Holy See, made by the Basilians in the sixteenth and seventeenth Sessions, rapidly disappeared. For, at the next Session, at

---

perinde ac si nulla commutatio, translatio seu dissolutio facta fuisset: quin immo praefatam commutationem, translationem, seu dissolutionem revocantes, ipsumque concilium Basileense pure, simpliciter, et cum affectu ac omni charitate amplectimur, pro viribusque illud promovere, ac omni favore prosequi intendimus *ita tamen, quod praesidentes nostri ad praefati concilii praesidentiam admittantur cum effectu, ac omnia et singula contra personam, auctoritatem, ac libertatem nostram et Sedis Apostolicae, ac venerabilium fratrum nostrorum S.R.E. Cardinalum, et aliorum quorumcumque nobis adhaerentium in dicto concilio facta et gesta per dictum concilium prius omnino tollantur et in pristinum statum reducantur.* Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1433, n. xviii. Another Bull to the same effect was issued by Eugene four days later. *Ibidem*, n. xx.

Augustinus Patricius, who was present, corroborates in his history of the Council what is stated by Eugene. "Eugenius," he writes (Summa Conciliorum, c. xxxiv.), "interea assiduis Caesaris persuasionibus pulsus cum partribus in hanc sententiam convenit: Basileenses omnio contra Eugenium, Apostolicam Sedem, Cardinales Romanae Ecclesiae et Pontificis sectatores acta revocarent, ejusque praesidentes admitterent." Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 1113.

John of Turrecremata declared that he had it on the best authority that the Bulls sanctioning the Council of Basle were extorted from Eugene by the threats of the cardinals to desert him unless he yielded. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1434, n. ii. See Palma, *Prael. in Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 67-68.

which the legates refused to attend, the decrees of the second and third were renewed. And most of the disciplinary legislation passed in subsequent sessions was aimed against the Papacy. Thus, in the twenty-third Session (March 25th, 1436), at which only ten bishops attended, decrees were passed abolishing annats payable to the Pope, and restricting his right to appoint to benefices. Aeneas Silvius the historian of the Council, who was present, says[1] that no disciplinary legislation had a chance of passing at Basle, except such as was directed against the Holy See. Against such conduct Eugene addressed letters of protest to the bishops and princes of Christendom.

Renewed opposition of the Council to the Papacy.

Early in the year 1437, representatives of the Greeks arrived at Basle, to arrange about the selection of a place for holding a united Council of the Latin and Greek Churches. On this point, as we should expect, the members of the Council were much divided. Two proposals were submitted in the twenty-fifth Session (May 7th, 1437), Florence or some other town in Italy being recommended by the legates, the majority of the bishops, and the Greek representatives; while the majority of the inferior clergy present were in favour of Basle, Avignon, or some city in Savoy. The choice of the former was approved by Eugene IV., who issued the Bull, *Doctoris Gentium*, on the 1st of October, transferring the Council from Basle to Ferrara.

Negotiations about a place for holding a united Council of Latins and Greeks.

Council transferred to Ferrara (Oct. 1st, 1437).

After this, all who had any regard for ecclesiastical

---

[1] "Mira res!" he writes, "quod patres Papae negabant, singularibus episcopis concedebant. Theodorico namque Moguntino non solum annatas exigere, sed bianatas indulserunt." Apud Raynaldum, Ad an. 1438.

authority withdrew from Basle. Those[1] who remained threw off all semblance of respect for the Papacy, and devoted themselves to bringing about its humiliation and degradation. The subsequent history of the Basilians is that of a schismatical conventicle. Having cited Eugene to appear at the Council, they declared him contumacious, and pronounced sentence of excommunication against him in the thirty-second Session (March 24th, 1438).

Those who remain at Basle form a schismatical conventicle.

A new confession of faith formulated.

With a view to prepare the way for the Pope's deposition, they drew up three articles[2] of faith in the thirty-third Session, to which he was required to subscribe, viz.—(*a*) that a General Council is superior to a Pope; (*b*) that a Pope cannot dissolve nor transfer a General Council lawfully convoked without its consent; and (*c*) that whoever denies either of these doctrines is a heretic. In the following Session, held on the 25th of June, 1438, the conventicle undertook, though there were only eight or nine bishops[3] present, to pronounce sentence of deposition against Eugene, on the ground that he refused to subscribe to the new profession of faith.

Eugene declared deposed June 25th, 1438.)

The schismatical ecclesiastics selected thirty-two members of the Council to elect a new Pope. The choice of the electoral committee fell on Amadeus, ex-Duke of

---

[1] They are thus described by John Polemar (Mansi, *Coll. Conc.*, xxxi. 201): "fuerunt quidam monachi apostatae et fugitivi, et nonulli vel notarii vel copistae, et quidam alii vix in sacris constituti, nullius aestimationis; qui quidem nec in dioecesanis nec in provincialibus conciliis de jure vel consuetudine admitterentur, qui Basileam ad hoc profecti fuerunt, et ad hoc morabantur, ut effugerent superiorum suorum correctionem, vel ut alios litibus vexarent, vel ut scandalum aliquod perpetrarent," &c.

[2] The articles were originally eight in number; but were afterwards reduced to three. Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, viii. 1262.

[3] Twelve were required by the law of the Church at the time for the deposition of an ordinary bishop.

Savoy, who had four years previously resigned his authority in favour of his son, and was at the time living at Ripaille,[1] on the southern shore of Lake Geneva, in company with a number of religious knights who recognised him as superior. Having consented (December 17), after some hesitation, to accept the office offered to him, Amadeus was proclaimed Pope, in the fortieth Session (February 26th, 1440), under the name of Felix V.

Election of the antipope Felix V. (1439).

Felix was recognised by very few outside his own country. The Basilians who had been so strict in regard to Eugene IV. made liberal provision for his support by levying a fifth on Church property for the coming five years, and a tenth for the following five. Felix, however, soon found that he had been deceived by those who elected him, as they represented scarcely anyone but themselves. He, therefore, withdrew to Lausanne, towards the end of 1442, under the pretence of ill health. Shortly after his departure the schismatical conventicle came to an end in its forty-fifth Session,[2] held on the 16th of May, 1443. Many of its members followed Felix to Lausanne, where they continued their deliberations for some time; but they do not appear to have drawn up any new decrees.

Withdraws to Lausanne (1442

End of the Council (1443

Whatever may be said about this Council[3] being

[1] The mode of life which he led here is described by Aeneas Silvius as very strict and ascetic; others, however, say that he lived in pleasure and ease. Jungmann, vi. 361.

[2] It was arranged at this Session that the next General Council should meet at Lyons after three years.—Hard., viii. 1301.

[3] Bellarmine says (*De Eccl. Milit.*, c. xvi.): "Dico concilium Basileense initio quidem fuisse legitimum; nam et legatus aderat Romani Pontificis et episcopi plurimi. At a quo tempore Eugenium deposuit et Felicem elegit, non fuit concilium ecclesiasticum, sed conciliabulum schismaticum, seditiosum et nullius prorsus auctoritatis."

Its authority

ecumenical in convocation, and in celebration as to some of its Sessions, it is certain that its decrees do not possess the authority of a General Council, as they were never confirmed by the Holy See.

Resignation of Felix V. (1449).

At length, in the year 1449, Felix was prevailed on by the Kings of France, Germany, and England, to submit to Nicholas V., the successor of Eugene IV., by whom he was made Cardinal Bishop of Sabina and Papal legate in Savoy. Thus was the schism created by the refractory conventicle of Basle healed, after it had continued for twelve years. Amadeus shortly afterwards resigned his ecclesiastical honours, and withdrew to his favourite retreat at Ripaille, where he died in 1451. The fruits of the schism, however, remained, for it weakened the authority[1] of the Holy See, and thus prepared the way for the great rebellion against the Papacy that occurred about a century later.

The Decrees of Basle received in France.

Though France never wavered in its allegiance to the lawful Pope, a national assembly held by Charles VII., at Bourges, in 1438, accepted most of the Basilian decrees—among others that declaring a General Council to be superior to the Pope—as they were said to be specially suitable to the needs of the French Church. A royal edict was drawn up embodying the decrees accepted, and promulgated under the name of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. Eugene IV. and his successors protested strongly against this sanction, as being directly opposed to the rights of the Holy See and the general interests of the

[1] John of Turrecremata thus describes how the Basilians contributed to weaken the authority of the Papacy:—"In Concilio Basileensi sub colore conversionis haereticorum aut reformationis Ecclesiae in capite et in membris practicata sunt multa mala et scandala orta; usurpata enim sunt Apostolicae Sedis privilegia et plura mala dogmata seminata."

Church. Louis XI. (1461-83), who was well-disposed towards the Church, issued a decree during the very first year of his reign abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction. But, owing to the opposition of the French Parliament, it remained in force till 1515, when it was finally abolished, as the result of a conference held at Bologna between Leo X. and Francis I., King of France.

The attitude of the German nation towards Eugene IV.

A diet of German princes, held at Frankfort, in 1438, to elect a successor to Sigismund (†1437), advocated a policy of neutrality between Eugene and the Council of Basle. The Germans continued in this attitude till February, 1447, when, owing chiefly to the exertions of the legates, Nicholas of Cusa, Thomas of Sarzana, and Carvajal, a concordat was entered into between them and the Papacy—known as the Concordat of Princes. By this treaty it was agreed—(*a*) that General Councils were to be held at regular intervals at the appointed time and place; (*b*) that the Archbishops of Treves and Cologne, who had been deposed for having declared in favour of neutrality between Eugene and the antipope, should be restored to their sees; (*c*) that the disciplinary decrees of Basle should remain in force till such time as special legislation could be enacted against certain abuses complained of by the Germans; and (*d*) that the authority of General Councils should be acknowledged and respected. When the concordat was concluded, the Germans immediately returned to their allegiance to Eugene IV.

The Concordat of Princes (1447).

B.—*The Council of Florence* (1438-45).

Council of Basle continued at Ferrara.

This Council, though held in three cities, is usually styled the Council of Florence, its chief work being done there; and was but a continuation of Basle, which was

transferred to Ferrara by the Bull *Doctoris Gentium* of Eugene IV. (October 1, 1437).

Its chief purpose.

Its chief purpose was to heal the schism between the Latin and Greek Churches, originated by Photius in the ninth century, and renewed by Michael Cerularius in the eleventh. Various efforts had been already made to heal the schism; but they all ended in failure, as it had been invariably political necessity that suggested to the Greeks to seek a reunion with Latin Christendom. A last great effort was made by the Council of Florence, which was attended with partial success. The Greeks, pressed by the Turks, consented to receive a formulary of union. But when they found that the new alliance did not save their tottering empire from ruin, they repudiated it, and with it the creed accepted at Florence.

The opening of the Council (Jan. 8th, 1438).

The Council was formally opened at Ferrara by Cardinal Albergatus, as the representative of the Pope, on the 8th of January, 1438. Two days later the first General Session was held, at which there were twenty-three bishops present. Eugene arrived at Ferrara, on the 27th of January, and assumed the presidency of the Council at the second Session (February 15th), at which seventy bishops attended.

Arrival of the Greeks.

The Greeks arrived at Ferrara, in March, to the number of about seven hundred, having been conveyed to Italy by a fleet chartered for their use by Eugene IV. Among them were the Emperor John Palaeologus; Joseph, Patriarch[1] of Constantinople; Bessarion, Archbishop of

[1] Among his followers was an ecclesiastic named Syropulus, who was opposed to the union between the Latins and Greeks, and wrote a partisan account of what occurred at Florence in his *Historia Vera Unionis non Verae; sive Concilii Florentini Exactissima Narratio.*

Nice; and representatives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. As many of the Greek ecclesiastics were very poor, the Pope was obliged to defray their expenses during their stay in the West, which he found to be a matter of no small difficulty, owing to the attitude of the Basilians and their adherents.

United Council opens (April 8th, 1438).

The united Council of the Latins and Greeks was formally declared opened on the 8th of April. A decree was issued commanding all who had been summoned to the Council to appear. And at the request of the Eastern Emperor the princes of Europe were invited to attend, either personally or through their representatives, in order that their assistance might be secured against the Turks. To give them sufficient time to put in an appearance, it was decided not to hold the first Public Session for four months.

Representatives selected to discuss points in dispute.

In the meantime, however, twelve representatives were selected from each side to discuss different points in dispute between the two Churches, the most prominent among the Latins being Cardinals Julian Cesarini[1] and Albergatus, Andrew, Archbishop of Rhodes, and John,[2] a Spanish Doctor of Divinity; while the most noteworthy among the Greek representatives were Bessarion, Archbishop of Nice, Isidore, Archbishop of Kiew, and Mark, Archbishop of Ephesus. It was arranged that they should hold three conferences each week. They had not proceeded far with their labours when they found that the only questions that presented any difficulty were—(*a*) the addition of the *Filioque* to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed; (*b*) the

[1] He left Basle when the Council was transferred to Ferrara.

[2] He is spoken of by some as John of Ragusa.

orthodoxy of the doctrine expressed by the addition; (*c*) the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; and (*d*) Purgatory.[1] To the discussions, therefore, of these questions, the fathers directed their chief attention.

The question of Purgatory discussed in private conferences.

It was decided[2] that the subject of Purgatory should be taken up first. The Latins propounded their views regarding it at a private conference held on the 4th of June. They maintained—(*a*) that there is an intermediate state between Heaven and Hell, where the souls of the just suffer the temporal punishment due to their sins; (*b*) that the souls in Purgatory derive assistance from the Sacrifice of the Mass and the good works of the faithful offered in their behalf; and (*c*) that the instrument of punishment in Purgatory is fire. The Greeks, while agreeing with the Latins on the two first-mentioned points, maintained that the souls in Purgatory are punished not by fire, but by darkness, gloom, and the privation of God. A long and heated discussion ensued about the nature of purgatorial punishment, which occupied the attention of the fathers down to the time when the Public Sessions commenced. It was finally decided to define the two points on which they agreed, while leaving the third a free question.

The first Session of the united Council was not held till

---

[1] Among the other points discussed and decided were those regarding the Epiclesis, and the kind of eucharistic bread to be used. The former was settled by the Greeks admitting that the Epiclesis was not essential to the form of consecration, and was merely inserted to invoke God's blessing on those who should participate in the Sacrifice.

The Latin practice of using unfermented bread at Mass was ably defended by John of Turrecremata. (*Hard.*, ix. 963-65.) It was finally agreed that either fermented or unfermented bread is valid matter, and that each Church should continue to use the kind to which it had been accustomed.

[2] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 18.

the 8th of October, when Bessarion of Nice addressed the assembled fathers, in favour of a reunion of the two Churches. To the same effect was the address delivered on behalf of the Latins at the second Session, held three days later by the Archbishop of Rhodes. For the purpose of expediting the business of the Council, it was decided at this Session that the public speaking should be confined to six elected representatives of each side; and that all discussions should be carried on in strictly scholastic form.

First Session of United Council (Oct. 8th

The addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed was taken up in the third Session.[1] The Greeks contended that the addition was a violation of the prohibition issued by the fathers of Constantinople[2] and Ephesus[3] against any change being made in the Creed which they accepted. The Latins, on the other hand, maintained that the prohibition was not violated, as it had been merely directed against changes at variance with the teaching of the Nicene Creed, and not against such as were needed to place a doctrine already embodied in it in a clearer light. The discussion of this subject extended from the third to the sixteenth Session (December 8th), when the addition was agreed to by the Greeks.

Addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed.

The next subject that was to come before the fathers was the orthodoxy of the doctrine expressed by the addition. But before this question could be discussed a plague made its appearance at Ferrara, which determined the Pope to transfer the Council to Florence in its sixteenth Session (January 10th, 1439).

Transfer of the Council to Florence (Jan. 10th, 1439)

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 35.
[2] *Ibid.*, i. 819.
[3] *Ibidem*, 1526.

The Procession of the Holy Ghost.

The seventeenth Session, or first of Florence, was held on the 26th of February. The Procession of the Holy Ghost occupied the attention of the Council up to the twenty-fourth Session (March 24th), when it was agreed to select ten from each side to discuss the question in private conferences. At length, the following formulary was submitted by the committee (June 3rd), and approved by the Pope. "Since the Latins, in saying that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son (*Filioque*) as from one principle, and by a single production, called spiration, mean the same thing as the Greeks, when they teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son (*per Filium*), there is no longer any obstacle to union."[1]

Death of Patriarch of Constantinople (June 9th, 1439)

About a week after this formulary had been agreed to, the Patriarch of Constantinople was found dead in his room. On a table beside him, was a written document, declaring that he died in communion with Rome, and exhorting his countrymen to follow his example.[2]

The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

The Primacy of the Holy See also gave rise to lengthened, and at times heated, discussions. The Greeks, while admitting the doctrine in theory, rejected some of its practical consequences, by refusing to allow appeals to the Pope from the East; and by denying the convocation of General Councils to be his exclusive privilege. This question was, however, settled on the 26th of June, by both sides agreeing to accept the following profession of faith:—"We acknowledge the Pope to be Sovereign Pontiff and Ruler, the representative and Vicar of Christ, the

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 399.
[2] *Ibidem*, 406.

pastor and teacher of all Christians, to the end that he may govern and rule the Church, but without detriment to the rights and prerogatives of the Eastern patriarchs."[1]

Decree of Union promulgated (July 6th, 1439).

The chief points of difference between the two Churches being thus amicably settled, six representatives were selected from each side to draw up a decree of union, in Latin and Greek. The decree having been prepared, and signed by the Pope, cardinals, Eastern emperor, and all the bishops present, except Mark of Ephesus, was publicly read, on the 6th of July, 1439, in Latin by Cardinal Julian; and in Greek, by Bessarion.

The Primacy of the Holy See defined.

The part of this decree most frequently quoted, is that regarding the Primacy, which runs thus:—"We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Bishop of Rome enjoys the Primacy throughout the world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles; that he is the Vicar of Christ, the Head of the Universal Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him was given by our Lord Jesus Christ, in St. Peter, the fulness of power to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church, as is set forth in the acts of Ecumenical Councils and in the Sacred Canons."[2]

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 414.

[2] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 423. The last clause of the decree which reads thus in Latin:—"quemadmodum etiam in gestis Oecumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur" has given rise to considerable controversy. Writers opposed to the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy, maintain that the clause is restrictive and not explanatory, so that the authority bestowed by Christ on St. Peter and his successors is to be determined by the decrees of Councils and the Sacred Canons. In support of their contention, they appeal to the words of the Greek text (*καθ' ὅν τρόπον*, &c.), which admit a restrictive meaning; as well as to the use of the word *et* in some Latin MSS. for *etiam*, which they say also favours a restrictive sense (Döllinger, *Janus*).

This difficulty admits of an easy solution. Though the clause in Greek

The Pope asks the Greeks to punish Mark of Ephesus, &c.

After the publication of the decree, the Pope asked the Greeks to punish Mark of Ephesus for his opposition to the union of the two Churches; to elect a patriarch before leaving Florence; and to no longer recognise adultery as a sufficient cause for dissolving marriage. The Greeks, in reply, stated[1] that they would punish the Archbishop on their return to the East; that they could not elect their patriarch at Florence, as precedent prescribed that the election should take place at Constantinople; and that, in the future, they would admit the sufficiency of adultery to dissolve marriage only in extreme cases.

Return of the Greeks to Constantinople (Feb. 1440).

The Greeks[2] left Florence shortly after the publication of the Decree of Union. On their arrival at Constantinople, in February, 1440, they met with an unfavourable reception from the populace, whose prejudices against the Latins had been stirred up by Mark of Ephesus, the avowed enemy of peace and union. After much difficulty, the Florentine Decree was promulgated in the Cathedral of

---

is ambiguous, admitting either an explanatory or restrictive meaning, that ambiguity is removed by the Latin form and by the context:—

(*a*) There were five copies of the Decree of Union drawn up and signed by all the fathers present. Of these two are still preserved in the Vatican Library in Rome, and the Laurentian Library in Florence. In each of them, as well as in all the old MS. copies extant, the word *etiam* occurs, which excludes a restrictive sense. It should be borne in mind that the Latin, if not the original, as most writers maintain, has at least equal authority with the Greek, as the two texts were signed and read publicly at the Council.

(*b*) The context requires that the clause should be understood in an explanatory sense. For, in a previous part of the decree it is stated that the Pope's authority is of Divine institution. It is obvious that such authority cannot be restricted by human legislation. See Frommann, *Criticism of the Florentine Decree of Union;* and Hergenröther, *The Errors of Four Hundred Bishops and their Censor.*

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 431.

[2] Bessarion and Isidore, who were created cardinals, remained in the West.

St. Sophia, in 1452. But the capture of Constantinople, in the following year, by Mohammed II., who secured the appointment of an enemy of the Latins to the Patriarchial See; and the opposition of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who issued a manifesto, condemning the Council of Florence, proved fatal to union between the two Churches.

Decree of Union published in Church of St. Sophia (1452).

Afterwards rejected.

The Council of Florence continued its labours after the departure of the Greeks, and succeeded in reconciling with the Church many of the Christian sectaries of the East. Most of these sectaries, influenced by the appeals of the Greek Emperor, and by the general desire then manifested to effect a reunion of the Churches of Christendom, sent delegates to Florence. A decree was drawn up for each sect, embodying the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as defined by the early Councils of the Church; the decree of union between the Latins and Greeks; and a full exposition of the truths of faith denied by the sect.

Council of Florence reconciles various Eastern sects with the Church

The first of the Eastern sectaries to seek reunion with Latin Christendom were the Armenians, who had already abjured their Monophysite errors. Representatives of their patriarch arrived at Florence towards the end of 1439, with full powers[1] to settle all points of difference between them and the Roman Church. A document was drawn up containing the Nicene Creed, the Symbol of St. Athanasius, the Decree of Union between the Latins and Greeks, and the Catholic teaching on the two Natures of Christ and the Seven Sacraments; and published under the name of the *Decree for the Armenians*, on 22nd November, 1440, with the approval of the Council.[2] The

The Armenians.

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 1015-16.

[2] "*Sacro approbante Concilio.*" *Ibidem*, 1018.

The Jacobites and Aethiopian Christians.

Jacobites were solemnly reconciled with the Church, on the 6th of February, 1441, the Decree of Union being substantially the same as in the case of the Armenians. Towards the end of the same year, many Aethiopian Christians were also reconciled with the Holy See.[1]

Council transferred to Rome (1442).

Owing to the small number of bishops present at Florence, the Council was transferred to the Lateran Basilica, in the year 1442. Here the fathers continued their labours in the interests of Union. Many of the Nestorians of Syria were united with the Church, in 1444. And the Maronites were reconciled during the following year, the Decree of Union being published on the 12th of August, 1445, after which the Council was dissolved. Many of the Eastern sectaries refused to acknowledge the Decrees of Union signed by their representatives at Florence and Rome, and formed themselves into independent communities, many of which continue down to the present day.

Nestorians of Syria and Maronites.

General testimony to the truth of Catholic faith.

The union of so many Churches at the Council of Florence, was clearly the result of a special providence[2] of God so arranging that the orthodoxy of the faith of Rome should be solemnly acknowledged throughout the Christian world, on the eve of the general rejection of that faith by the so-called Reformers.

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 1032-37.

[2] Palma, *Prael. in Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 90, 91; Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 397.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE POPES FROM NICHOLAS V. TO PAUL II.

Nicholas V. (1447-55).

On the death of Eugene IV., the cardinals went into conclave on the 4th of March, 1447, and on the third day elected Cardinal Thomas of Sarzana,[1] Bishop of Bologna, who took the name of Nicholas V. He was a man of extensive and varied learning, and had acquired a high reputation by the ability with which he had defended the cause of the Latins against the Greeks at Ferrara and Florence.

The Concordat of Aschaffenburg (1448).

One of his first acts after his elevation to the Papacy was to conclude an agreement with the Emperor Frederick III. of Germany (1440-1493) regarding some points in dispute between the Church and State in that country. The agreement is known in history as the Concordat of Aschaffenburg, from the name of the town where the preliminaries were settled (July, 1447), though the Concordat was concluded at Venice (February, 1448). It was stipulated—(*a*) that the decrees of Basle which had been received in Germany should be no longer binding; (*b*) that the disposal of all benefices belonging to a member of the Papal Court, and to persons dying in Rome, or within two days' journey of Rome, as well as all benefices vacated by deposition, translation, resignation, or invalidity of election,

[1] His real name was Thomas Parentuccelli, but was commonly styled Thomas of Sarzana, from his mother's birthplace.

should appertain to the Holy See; (*c*) that bishops and abbots, except in the cases mentioned, should be canonically elected, and that the choice of the electors should receive the approval of the Pope, unless when, acting on the advice of the cardinals, he determined to appoint a more worthy person;[1] (*d*) that the right of presentation to the benefices of a diocese, with some exceptions, should belong during alternate months[2] to the Holy See and their ordinary patron; and (*e*) that a fixed tax should take the place of annats in the case of vacant sees and abbacies, a half-year's income being payable from all other vacant benefices. This concordat, which had the approval[3] of the German electors, was inserted in the statute-book of the Empire, and formed the basis of all subsequent negotiations between the Papacy and the Empire down to the commencement of the present century.

The fall of Constantinople 1453)

The most memorable event of his pontificate was the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. They had besieged the city in 1422, but were repulsed by the Greeks. Their attack was renewed with more success about thirty years later. The siege commenced on the 6th of April, 1453. The city was bravely defended by the Emperor Constantine, at the head of 8,000 soldiers, against an army of about 300,000 Turks.[4] Constantine, who had been chiefly instrumental in having the Florentine Decree of

---

[1] "Nisi ex causa rationabili et evidenti, et de fratrum consilio, de digniori et utiliori persona duxerit providendum." Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, xi. 569.

[2] Those months in which the Pope enjoyed the right of presentation were known as the Menses Papales, viz., January, March, &c.

[3] Hefele, xi. 566.

[4] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv. 363-367.

union promulgated in the Church of St. Sophia, on the previous 12th of December, appealed for assistance to the West. Nicholas, though disgusted with the treachery of the Greeks,[1] and especially of their late Emperor, John Palæologus († 1448) who had repudiated the union of the two Churches towards the end of his life, resolved[2] to procure, if possible, the required assistance. But before the Venetian and Genoese fleets that had been chartered to convey the Latin crusaders to Constantinople left their ports, the news arrived in the West that the city had been taken by the Turks on the 29th of May, the day determined by Mohammedan astrologers for the final assault, and that the Emperor had been among the slain. The Church of St. Sophia was converted into a Turkish Mosque, and many other churches and monasteries converted to profane uses by the victorious Mussulmans.

Its effects on the literary tastes of Latin Christendom.

The fall of Constantinople had an all-powerful influence in giving a new direction to the tastes of European scholars. Many of the literary treasures that had been preserved in the East were brought to Italy and other countries of the West by Greek refugees. For the reception of these treasures, the Vatican Library was founded by Nicholas. He also sent learned men[3] to Greece and other countries to collect or transcribe all the ancient manuscripts they cound find for his new library, which soon contained seven thousand volumes. "To his munificence,"

---

[1] So strong was the opposition of many of the Greeks to the Latins, that a high official of the imperial household is said to have declared that he should prefer to see the turban of the Sultan than the tiara of the Pope ruling in Constantinople. Gibbon, iv. 365.

[2] Platina, *De Vitis Pontif. Rom.* (Cologne, 1568), 306.

[3] See Platina, *De Vitis Pontif. Rome*, 316.

says Gibbon,[1] "the Latin world was indebted for the versions of Xenophon, Diodorus, Polybius, Thucydides, Herodotus, and Appian; of Strabo's Geography, of Ptolemy and Theophrastus, and of the fathers of the Greek Church."

The importation of so many valuable MSS. into the West, and the invention of printing,[2] about 1450, contributed to make the pontificate of Nicholas an age of great literary activity throughout Europe, and specially in Italy. Among the most distinguished scholars of the age were Laurence Valla, Theodore Gaza, George of Trebizond, Chalcondyles, and Constantine Lascaris. Rome and Florence were the two great centres of intellectual activity, owing to the encouragement given to learning by Nicholas V., and by Cosmo de' Medici and his successors.

Revival of Platonic Philosophy.

The supremacy so long enjoyed by Aristotle began about this time to be questioned by the students of Plato. The revival of Platonic Philosophy was principally due to the labours of Gemistus Pletho, a native of Morea, in Greece. He succeeded in instilling his own opinions into the minds of many learned contemporaries, the most prominent being his pupil Cardinal Bessarion and Cosmo de' Medici. Owing to the great influence of the latter, Florence became the chief stronghold of Platonism.

Notwithstanding the well-deserved popularity enjoyed

---

[1] iv. 338.

[2] There has been considerable controversy as to whether Gutemburg of Mentz, or Costar of Haarlem should be considered the inventor of printing from movable letters. Critical opinion appears to be in favour of the former. The first book printed by him was a Latin Bible which appeared about 1452. The art of block printing, *i.e.*, of printing from impressions cut in blocks of wood, had been known long before this time. See Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, i. 150-60.

by Nicholas throughout Christendom, there were to be found some Romans wicked enough to enter into a conspiracy with a nobleman named Porcaro,[1] against his civil rule.[2] Fortunately, however, the plot was discovered before it was fully matured, and the chief leaders[3] executed (January 9, 1453). The ingratitude of the Romans had a most disheartening effect on Nicholas, and served to bring about his premature death, in 1455.

The Conspiracy of Porcaro.

His successor was Cardinal Alphonsus Borgia, a native of Valencia, in Spain, who took the name of Calixtus III. The new Pope, who was about eighty years of age at the time of his appointment, was well versed in the sacred sciences, and was considered the best jurist of his age.

Calixtus III. (1455-58).

He commenced his pontificate (1455-58) by issuing an appeal to the princes of Europe to organize a crusade against the Turks whose victorious progress appeared so menacing to the nations of the West. And he ordered[4] that the church bells should be rung each day at noon to obtain the prayers of the faithful for the success of those who were engaged in the Holy Wars. This is supposed to have been the origin of the devotion of the Angelus which

His efforts to organize a crusade.

---

[1] He had already endeavoured, immediately after the death of Eugene IV., to establish a republican form of government in Rome, and had been pardoned by Nicholas V., who appointed him ruler of Anagni. Platina, *De Vitis Pontif. Rom.*, 309.

[2] According to a contemporary writer named Manetti, the aim of the conspirators was to put the Pope to death. Raynaldus, Ad an. 1453, n. xxiv.

[3] In the *Papal Diary* (n. cxi.) of Stephen Infessura, who flourished towards the end of the fifteenth century, it is stated that Porcaro and his associates were put to death without receiving absolution or the Holy Eucharist. From this it has been unfairly inferred by some anti-Catholic writers that Nicholas forbade the administration of the last sacraments to the culprits. Raynaldus, *ibidem*.

[4] Platina, 318.

prevails so generally throughout the Church at present. Owing to his exertions and the preaching of St. John of Capistran († 1456), an army of 40,000 men was sent to assist Huniades, King of Hungary. The Turks attacked Belgrade on the 3rd of June, 1456. After a siege of forty-six days, they were routed[1] with great slaughter. Both Huniades and St. John, who were present and took an active part in the engagement,[2] died shortly after.

The Turks defeated at Belgrade (1456).

At the request of the relatives of Joan of Arc,[3] the Pope

---

[1] In memory of this victory Calixtus instituted, or according to some re-established, the Feast of the Transfiguration (August 6).

[2] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1456, n. v.

[3] This remarkable maiden was born of humble and pious parents in the village of Domremy, in the year 1412. From her earliest years she gave evidence of great piety, and of charity to the poor. She could neither read nor write; her chief occupation consisted in looking after her father's cattle—hence called the Shepherdess of Domremy.

From the age of thirteen she had frequent visions, during which St. Michael, St. Catherine, and St. Margaret appeared to her, assisting her in her difficulties, and encouraging her to renewed fervour in her devotions. When she was sixteen years of age her future mission was made known to her. She was told that she was destined to be the means of restoring Charles VII. to the Crown of France, which had been recently transferred by the treaty of Troyes (1420) to the King of England.

In obedience to the instructions she had received from her celestial visitors, she left her father's house in May, 1428, and went to Vaucouleurs. Here she exchanged her female dress for male attire, and received from the governor of the town a sword, and an escort to conduct her safely to the Dauphin, who was staying in the castle of Chinon, near Tours. Speaking of her new dress, she says: "I have not taken this dress, nor done anything, but by the orders of God and His Angels."

Having been brought before Charles, she explained God's designs in his regard, and secured a favourable hearing by showing that she knew secrets of his which were supposed to be unknown to anyone on earth. Charles, feeling that there was something extraordinary about the maiden, sent her to Poitiers, where she was examined for three weeks by a Council of ecclesiastics, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Rheims. Acting on the recommendation of the Council, the King gave her an army of 12,000 men

ordered the Archbishop of Rheims and the Bishop of Paris to institute an inquiry into the charges alleged against her by her English accusers, on account of which she had been burned as a heretic, at Rouen, on the 30th of May, 1431. The result of the inquiry was most favourable to Joan's

Inquiry into charges alleged against Joan of Arc.

---

to go to Orleans, which was then besieged by the English. She entered the besieged city in the face of the enemy on the 29th of April, 1429, and nine days later she compelled the English to raise the siege and depart from Orleans—hence she has been called the Maid of Orleans.

She then conducted Charles to Rheims, compelling many English strongholds on the way to capitulate. Here the ceremony of his coronation was performed on the 17th July, amidst great popular rejoicings. Addressing the newly-crowned king, Joan said: "Gentle Sir, now is accomplished the good pleasure of God, who willed that I should raise the siege of Orleans, and bring you to this city of Rheims to receive your sacred anointing, showing thereby that you are the true sovereign to whom the kingdom should belong." It is said that she was anxious to return forthwith to Domremy, and resume her former duties in her father's house; but that, owing to the King's representations, she consented to prolong her stay with the French army.

On the 24th May, 1430, she fell into the hands of the Burgundians, the enemies of Charles VII., who were engaged in besieging Compiegne; and was sold by them for ten thousand francs to the English, by whom she was treated with every form of indignity. Having been brought before the tribunal of Couchon, Bishop of Beauvais, at Rouen, she was accused of heresy and witchcraft. She was declared to have admitted some charges alleged against her; and having afterwards denied the truth of these charges, she was condemned to be burned as a relapsed heretic. With her last breath she prayed for her persecutors, and declared her innocence of the charges alleged against her.

The career of Joan of Arc is, perhaps, the most marvellous recorded in the pages of history. That a poor country girl, who had not yet left her teens, should, without any previous education, assume the leadership of armies, inspire her soldiers with enthusiasm and confidence, and conquer the hitherto victorious forces of England, is suggestive of something more than the natural. "We cannot pretend," says Hallam (*Middle Ages*, i. 79), "to explain the surprising story of the Maid of Orleans; for, however easy it may be to suppose that a heated and enthusiastic imagination produced her own visions, it is a much greater problem to account for the credit they obtained, and for the success that attended her." See Quicherat, *Condemnation et Rehabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*, Paris (1850); Lanery d'Arc., *Memoires et Consultationes en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris, 1889); and J. Ayroles, S.J., *La Pucelle devant l'Eglise de son Temps* (Paris, 1890).

character. The sentence of guilt pronounced against her by the Bishop of Beauvais was reversed, and she was declared to have died "a martyr for her faith, her king, and her country."

Pius II. 1458-64).

On the death of Calixtus III., Aeneas Silvius was raised to the Papal Throne, under the name of Pius II. His history affords a striking illustration of the changeableness of human fortune. He was born at Corsignano, in 1405, and was descended from the noble, but impoverished, family of the Piccolomini of Sienna.[1] He spent his earlier years in idleness and frivolous pursuits. At the age of eighteen he began to apply himself with diligence to his studies, and soon acquired a high reputation for his knowledge of Latin, as well as for his proficiency in canon and civil law. At the age of twenty-six he accompanied Cardinal Capranica, Bishop of Fermo, to the Council of Basle. The eloquence and ability with which he defended the action of the fathers, secured his appointment to the position of recorder of the Council.[2] After the election of Felix V. he became secretary to the antipope. Having been sent on a mission to Frederick III. of Germany, he was crowned Poet Laureate (1442), and accepted the invitation of the Emperor to become his secretary.

His early life.

His reconciliation with Eugene IV.

He was sent three times to Rome to negotiate terms of peace between the Papacy and the empire. On the last occasion he was reconciled with Eugene, by whom he was made private secretary, and ordained sub-deacon. He was appointed Bishop of Trieste by Nicholas V., and four years later transferred to the see of Sienna; and was finally created cardinal by Calixtus III. in 1456.

---

[1] Platina, 321.

[2] Platina, 322.

In accordance with the engagement entered into by the cardinals at the conclave in which he was elected, Pius laboured energetically throughout his pontificate (1458-64) to organize a crusade, Within two months after his elevation he summoned the princes of Christendom to meet at Mantua on the 1st of June, 1459. The assembly was opened by the Pope in person on the day appointed. Very few princes put in an appearance, most of those who attended being rulers, whose possessions were in immediate danger of invasion by the Mohammedans. The Emperor of Germany was carrying on war against the successor of Huniades in Hungary; England was engaged in the Wars of the Roses; the resources of France had been exhausted by her recent lengthened struggle with England; while the Spanish sovereigns felt that their forces were needed to contend with the enemies of Christianity nearer home. The deliberations of the assembly continued till the 19th of January, 1460, when it was dissolved. Pius found that the princes of Europe were too much divided by conflicting interests to render any effective assistance against the Turks, and could only procure promises that they would assist in organizing a crusade in the immediate future. These promises, however, were not fulfilled.

Meeting held at Mantua to organize Crusade (1459).

Result of the Meeting.

Appeals from the judgment of the Holy See to a future General Council had recently become rather frequent, owing to the baneful effect of the decrees of Constance and Basle. Such appeals were forbidden under the penalty of excommunication by Pius in the Bull *Execrabilis*, issued at Mantua, on the day preceding the end of the conference.

The Bull *Execrabilis*

Finding that the crusading enthusiasm of Europe had died out, he addressed a letter to Mohammed II. in 1461, exhorting him to abandon a religion that was evidently

Pius II. endeavours to convert the Sultan.

false, and embrace Christianity as the best means of attaining fame here and happiness hereafter. And it is generally supposed that it was at his suggestion Nicholas of Cusa wrote his work *De Pace et Concordantia Fidei*, to bring about the conversion of the Mohammedans.

a Bull of retractations (1463).

Finding that his past views and conduct were often appealed to by the enemies of the Papacy, in defence of their conduct, he issued his Bull of Retractations in 1463. "In my youth," he says, "I erred in ignorance; and, like Saul of old, persecuted the Church and the Apostolic See. Some may say, 'Aeneas, who afterwards became Pope, wrote thus,' and may fancy that Pius II. and the Holy See approve what Aeneas wrote. Let them, therefore, regard those early writings as of no consequence, and believe what Aeneas now teaches—that the Pope, receiving the plenitude of authority over the whole Church immediately from Jesus Christ, confers all power possessed by the other members of the body ecclesiastic."

death.

Pius II., feeling that his health was giving way, and that his end was fast approaching, resolved to make a last effort against the enemies of Christian Europe. He issued a Bull[1] early in 1464, asking the princes of Europe to assemble with their followers at Ancona, from which a fleet would convey them to the scene of war. His appeal was responded to only by Venice and Hungary. To encourage the crusaders, he resolved to accompany them himself, and set out for Ancona on the 19th of June. But as he was about to sail he took seriously ill, and passed to his reward on the 14th of August, 1464. His death put an end to the crusade.

[1] Platina, 326.

Before the election of a successor the cardinals entered into a solemn compact, consisting of numerous articles, the chief being—(*a*) that the future Pope should hold a General Council within three years; (*b*) that he should create no new cardinal till the members of the Sacred College were reduced to twenty-four, and that they should never be raised above that number; (*c*) that he should not raise to the cardinalate anyone under thirty years of age, nor anyone who was not well versed in the sacred sciences, nor more than one of his own relatives; and (*d*) that he should endeavour to organize a crusade.

Compact entered into by the Cardinals.

The choice of the conclave fell on Cardinal Peter Barbo, a Venetian by birth, and a nephew of Eugene IV., who took the name of Paul II. One of his first acts was to annul the agreement of the cardinals, as it imposed too great a check on the authority of the Holy See. He endeavoured, however, to give effect to those provisions of the compact that he considered conducive to the general interests of the Church.

Paul II. (1464-71).

He abolished the Court of Abbreviators, which had been established by the Avignon Popes, for the preparation of Bulls and Briefs, and had been reconstituted by Pius II., because of numerous abuses connected with it. We are told that many of the abbreviators had secured their appointment by simoniacal means; while others belonged to a society formed at Rome for promoting the study of Latin literature, whose members had recently given ample evidence that their minds were unduly swayed by republican dreams, and that their religious belief was tainted by pagan ideas and practices.

He abolishes the Court of Abbreviators.

Among those who suffered by the abolition of the court

He incurs the displeasure of Platina.

was Platina[1] († 1481) the future biographer of the Popes, who had been raised to the office of abbreviator by Pius II. He wrote an abusive letter to Paul, charging him with injustice, and appealing against him to the princes of Europe. For this he was arrested and thrown into prison; but was released after a confinement of four months. He was afterwards arrested, in 1468, with other members of the literary academy, on the charge of apostasy from the faith; but, as the charge could not be substantiated, he was released. He was afterwards appointed by Sixtus IV., librarian in the Vatican.

His character as described by Platina.

In his *Lives of the Roman Pontiffs*, Platina draws an unfavourable picture of Paul, painting him as an enemy of literature, a lover of ease and pleasure, and a man of insatiable avarice.[2] Before accepting the truth of these charges we should remember—(*a*) the relations that existed between Platina and Paul II.; (*b*) that the writer himself confesses[3] that the Pope was highly esteemed by many for his justice and clemency; and (*c*) that he is praised by contemporary writers[4] for his liberality, his piety, and his efforts to promote the interests of learning.

---

[1] His original name was Bartholomew Sacchi. But he is usually called Platina, from the latinized name of his birth-place, Piadena, near Cremona. Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, iii. 72.

[2] *De Vitis Pont. Rom.*, pp. 342, 343.

[3] "Justus tamen est habitus et clemens." *Ibidem.*

[4] Thus, Cardinal Aegidius of Viterbo says: "Tam liberalis Paulus fuit ut paucis egentium non donaverit . . . amavit fovitque quosdam bonae indolis et literarum virtutumque studiosos." And F. Philadelphus says: "Avaritiae vero quae unquam suspicio in Paulum cecidit, qui et omnem semper simoniacam licitationem ac pravitatem perinde atque pestiferum morbum oderat, et indulgentias item ipsas temporum necessitate concessas, quoniam lucrariae vidérentur, magna ex parte abrogavit?" Apud Raynaldum., *Annales*, Ad an. 1471, nn. lxiii., lxiv.

Death of the Christian hero Scanderbeg (1467).

It was during the Pontificate of Paul II. that the illustrious Scanderbeg,[1] the most successful champion of the Christian cause against the Turks, passed to his reward. He was the son of an Albanian chief, and was born in 1414. Albania[2] having been reduced to subjection by Amurath II., he was sent at the early age of nine to the court of the Sultan as one of the hostages for the submission of his countrymen. While here he won the esteem of all with whom he came in contact, by his intelligence, bravery, and nobility of character, and was appointed by Amurath to some of the highest offices under the Crown. He returned to Albania in 1443, and placing himself at the head of his countrymen, asserted their independence of Mussulman rule. For almost a quarter of a century he defied, from the mountain fastnesses of his native country, the most powerful armies that Amurath II. and his successor Mohammed II. could send against him. At length he passed to his reward in 1467, after having defeated the Turks in twenty-two battles, and slain as many as two thousand of them with his own hand. Within a year after his death his native Albania was again reduced to subjection to the Ottoman yoke.

---

[1] His real name was George Castriota. He was called Scanderbeg, *i.e.*, Prince Alexander, by the Turks.

[2] Albania is a mountainous district situated to the east of the Adriatic

CHAPTER XX.

THE POPES FROM SIXTUS IV. TO JULIUS II.

The political Popes.

THE Popes who occupied the chair of St. Peter from Sixtus IV. to Julius II., and even later, according to some,[1] are commonly spoken of as the political Popes, because of the special attention which they paid to the civil affairs of Italy. The prominent part which they took in Italian politics was chiefly owing to the efforts made by many of the vassals of the Holy See towards the end of the fifteenth and early in the sixteenth century to assert their independence. Sixtus IV. and his successors resolved to maintain the rights and privileges of the Papacy as handed down to them, and were thereby involved in various quarrels which raised up against them many enemies, and prevented them from paying sufficient attention to the reformation of the Church in her head and members, for which Christendom was clamouring.

Sixtus IV. (1471-84).

On the death of Paul II. the choice of the conclave fell on Cardinal Francis della Rovere, formerly general of the Franciscans, who took the name of Sixtus IV.

Immediately after his accession, Sixtus directed his attention to organizing a crusade. He contemplated[2] holding a General Council as the best means of settling the differences that existed among Christian princes, and

---

[1] Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 426.
[2] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1474, n. xi.

His efforts to organize a Crusade.

of securing concerted action against the Turks. But he was obliged to abandon the idea owing to the difficulties thrown in his way by the Emperor of Germany and others. He then sent legates to the different courts of Europe to plead the cause of the holy war; but their mission appears to have been unsuccessful.

The Turks capture Otranto (1480).

The Turks, taking advantage of the divided state of Christian Europe, became more aggressive. They attacked Rhodes early in the year 1480; but they were repulsed with great slaughter by the Knights Hospitallers, who then ruled in that island. They next turned their arms against Otranto, the chief Italian port on the Adriatic during the Middle Ages, and having captured the city (August 17) put twelve thousand[1] of its inhabitants to death. Italy was, however, saved by the death of Mohammed II., on the 3rd of May, 1481. The quarrels that ensued between his sons for the vacant crown gave the Christians an easy opportunity of retaking Otranto after it had been in the hands of the Turks for about a year.

The struggle between the Medici and Pazzi in Florence.

The latter years of his pontificate were disturbed by a quarrel in which he was involved with the Florentines. They were divided into two factions, the one being led by the Medici, and the other by the Pazzi. The former had recently acquired supreme authority in Florence owing to the munificent generosity of Cosmo and his successors. The Medici abused their power by excluding members of the rival party from all offices of emolument in the republic, and by punishing them in various other ways. The Pope intervened by sending his nephew, Cardinal Raphael

[1] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1480, n. iii.

The Pope endeavours to terminate it.

Riario, as legate to Florence, hoping that he might be able to bring about peace between the opposing parties. But the efforts of the cardinal, who was supposed to be in favour of the Pazzi, were without any result.

Conspiracy organized against the Medici (1478).

At length the Pazzi, unable to endure any longer the tyrannical treatment to which they and their followers were being subjected, organized a conspiracy to assassinate Lorenzo de' Medici and his brother, Julian, whom they held responsible for the conduct of the ruling power in Florence. The plot having been fully matured, the two Medici were set on as they were attending high mass, on the 26th of April, 1478. The attempt, however, of the conspirators only half succeeded. Julian[1] was slain, but his brother escaped with a slight wound. Julian's murder was immediately avenged by the infuriated Florentines. All suspected of being implicated in the conspiracy were arrested and put to death, among them being many of the Pazzi, together with Salviati, Archbishop of Pisa; while the Cardinal legate was cast into prison.

Death of Archbishop of Pisa, and imprisonment of Papal legate.

Sixtus punished this flagrant violation of ecclesiastical

[1] Sixtus has been charged by many writers with having been responsible for the murder of Julian, on the strength of the confession made by one of the conspirators named John Baptist of Montesecco. The latter stated immediately before his execution that he urged James de' Pazzi to organize the conspiracy, by telling him that the Pope had given his approval to the formation of a combination (called by Panvinius *conspiratio*) for the expulsion of the Medici from power. That Sixtus should have advocated a change of government in Florence, is what we should expect when we remember—(*a*) that the Medici had acted so tyrannically towards their opponents; (*b*) that they had confiscated the ecclesiastical property of the Bishop of Pisa, which lay within the limits of the Florentine Republic: and (*c*) that on many occasions they had pursued a policy hostile to the Holy See. (Panvinius, *De Vitis Pont. Rom.*, 347.) There is, however, no satisfactory evidence to show that Sixtus was an approver of the conspiracy to murder the Medici. (Palma, *Prael. in Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 149-152.)

immunities by placing Florence under interdict, excommunicating Lorenzo de' Medici, and declaring his children, as well as those of the chief officials of the republic, incapable of receiving orders. The Florentines having concluded an alliance with France, Ferrara, Venice, and Milan, treated the Papal censures with open defiance, and inflicted severe penalties on those ecclesiastics who dared to observe them. War ensued between them and the Pope, who was assisted by Ferdinand of Naples and the Siennese. Hostilities continued till 1480, when the arrival of the Turks in Italy compelled the Christian powers of that country to unite for defence against their common enemy.

Florence laid under interdict.

Reconciliation between the Florentines and Holy See (1480).

According to some contemporary writers, Sixtus was a man utterly unworthy of the exalted office which he filled. His most glaring defect was his nepotism. He raised, we are told, at least sixteen of his immediate relatives[1] to positions of honour and emolument in the Church, some of whom were by no means calculated to bring honour on the ecclesiastical state.[2] He also sought in various ways to elevate the condition of his lay relatives. Thus he created a principality for his nephew, Jerome Riario, by bestowing on him some of the estates of the Church. And he brought about a marriage between another nephew and an illegitimate daughter of Ferdinand of Naples. Immediately after his marriage, Ferdinand petitioned Sixtus for a reduction of the tribute which he was obliged to pay to the Holy See, as Sicily had been separated from the

Nepotism of Sixtus IV.

Tribute payable to the Holy See from Naples practically abolished.

[1] For explanation of the conduct of some of the Popes in raising so many of their relatives to high offices in the Church at a time when they found it difficult to rely on others, see Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 429-35.

[2] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1471, n. xii.

Crown of Naples. The Pope went much further than the petition required, for he commuted the tribute into a white horse, which was to be sent to Rome each year.

The learning and generosity of Sixtus.

According to Panvinius,[1] the Continuator of Platina, Sixtus was well versed in the sacred sciences, and had acquired a European fame even before his elevation to the Papacy for his profound knowledge of theology and for his zeal as a preacher. He was also favourably known for his charity and his munificent generosity. Thus he enlarged and beautified the Vatican Library, built the Sistine Chapel, and in many other ways improved the material condition of Rome.

Innocent VIII. (1484-92).

Sixtus was succeeded by Cardinal John Baptist Cibo, who took the name of Innocent VIII. In his early life he had been married[3] and had become the father of many children.[4] But on the death of his wife he became an ecclesiastic, and was created cardinal by Sixtus IV.

Ferdinand, King of Naples.

Shortly after his accession, Innocent became involved in a quarrel with Ferdinand of Aragon, on whom his predecessor had bestowed the crown of Naples. Ferdinand conducted himself as a tyrant towards his subjects, and violated the rights of the Church by intruding his own favourites into episcopal sees and appropriating ecclesiastical revenues.

The Neapolitans appealed for protection to Innocent, who was their feudal lord. The Pope pronounced sentence

---

[1] *De Vitis Pontif. Rom.*, 345, 346,

[2] "Nihil enim unquam Sixtus quod publico urbis decori et commoditati esse censeret quin perficeret destitit." *Ibidem*, 351.

[3] Ciaconius, *Vitae et Res Gestae Pontif. Rom.*, iii. 95.

[4] Some of them, according to many writers, were illegitimate. Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1484.

of deposition against Ferdinand, and sent an army to Naples to carry the sentence into effect. Ferdinand was obliged to submit. He undertook (1486) to pay the annual tribute remitted by Sixtus IV., and to respect the ecclesiastical and civil rights of his subjects.

Reconciliation between Pope and Ferdinand (1486).

But scarcely had peace been restored when Ferdinand began to violate his solemn engagements by claiming the right to appoint to all sees within his dominions, and by causing some Neapolitan nobles whom he had suspected of being his enemies to be murdered at a banquet to which he had invited them. He was again deposed, and his kingdom offered to Charles VIII. of France. War was renewed between him and the Pope, which continued till 1492, when peace was restored by a treaty similar in terms to that entered into in 1486.[1]

Renewal of the quarrel.

On the death of Mohammed II. a struggle ensued between his two sons, Bajazet II. and Zizim, for the vacant crown, the latter basing his claim on the fact that he was born after his father's accession. Zizim, having been defeated sought refuge in Rhodes. The Knights Hospitallers, who ruled there, having got possession of him, sent him to France, from which he was transferred, in 1489, to Rome. Here he was kept in honourable captivity. Bajazet II. offered Innocent an annual grant of 40,000 ducats to keep his brother in confinement. The Pope accepted the offer, for which he has been severely censured by many writers. In judging of his action, however, we must remember that the course which he adopted appeared at the time to be the only effective means at his disposal of saving Western

The Turkish Prince Zizim falls into the hands of the Christians.

Negotiations between Innocent VIII. and Bajazet II.

[1] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1492, n. x.

Europe from invasion by the Turks, as Christian princes had sufficiently shown by their conduct that little or no assistance was to be expected from them.

Nepotism of Innocent.

Innocent imitated the nepotism of his predecessor. For instance, he made the illegitimate son of his brother Archbishop of Benevento, and shortly afterwards Cardinal. And he brought about a marriage between his son Francis and the daughter of Lorenzo de' Medici, against whom his predecessor had struggled so strenuously. This alliance is supposed to have been prompted by the Pope's desire to secure the assistance of the Florentine Republic against Ferdinand of Naples, with whom he was at the time engaged in war. The Pope bestowed the dignity of Cardinal on Lorenzo's son, John,[1] who was only thirteen years at the time; but required that he should not enter on the duties of his office till he had reached his eighteenth year.

The creation and sale of public offices at Rome.

During the pontificate of Innocent, as well as that of his predecessor, many new offices were created at Rome, and sold for a stipulated amount, the purchasers acquiring the right to a fixed income during their lives. This was looked on at the time as a lawful means of getting money to defray the expenses of the wars that were being carried on against the Mohammedans. The newly-created public offices constituted the Government Stock of the fifteenth century. Ranke, writing on this subject, says:[2]—"The system of public debt with which we are all now encompassed, and which exercises so paramount an influence over all the springs of commerce, was first systematically developed in the States of the Church."

[1] He afterwards became Pope, under the name of Leo X.

[2] *History of the Popes* (2nd Eng. ed.), 102.

The pontificate of Innocent's successor, Alexander VI., is memorable in the history of the Papacy, as well on account of his personal character, as because of the important public events in which he took a prominent part. *Alexander VI.* (1492-1503).

Roderick Borgia—for such was his name before his elevation to the Papacy—was born at Valencia, in Spain, in the year 1431. In his early years he had been at first, according to the generally received account,[1] a lawyer and afterwards a soldier, and finally became an ecclesiastic. He was appointed archbishop of his native city by his uncle, Calixtus III., in 1456; and was shortly afterwards raised to the cardinalate. He was held in high esteem by Sixtus IV., by whom he was appointed successively to the sees of Albano and Porto;[2] and is described by Panvinius as a man of considerable powers of eloquence, great administrative tact, and wonderful versatility.[3] His early life.

During the earlier years of his ecclesiastical career he was favourably known for his piety and charity. Unfortunately, however, he did not retain this character long. The first indication of a suspicion against his virtue is contained in a letter[4] addressed to him by Pius II., in 1460, reproving him for having been present at a garden party at Sienna, in circumstances that were by no means creditable to a prince of the Church. He shortly afterwards became acquainted with a Roman lady named Vanozza, His character cardinal.

---

[1] Ciaconius, *Vitae et Rae Gestae Pontiff, Rom.*, iii. 147. Some writers maintain that he had been devoted to the ecclesiastical state from the very beginning. See Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 443.

[2] Panvinius, *De Vitis Pontiff, Rom.* 357.

[3] "Cum jucundis de remissione, cum sinceris de disciplina, cum patribus de republica loquebatur." *Ibidem*, 362.

[4] For letter, see Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1460, nn. xxxi., xxxii.

by whom he had five children,[1] of whom four were living when he became Pope, viz., John, Cæsar, Geoffrey, and Lucretia.

His election.

Notwithstanding his immoral conduct, Cardinal Roderick Borgia succeeded by the free expenditure of money and other means in securing two-thirds of the votes of the twenty-two cardinals who entered into conclave after the death of Innocent VIII. Panvinius says[2] that all those who were responsible for his election were soon afterwards visited by death, exile, or some other signal punishment.

Discovery of America (1492).

The first year of his pontificate was marked by the discovery of America.[3] Christopher Columbus († 1506), the most renowned explorer the world has ever known, set out on his voyage of discovery on the 3rd of August, 1492, actuated by the twofold motive of extending the kingdom of God on earth, and of acquiring money to organize a crusade against the Mohammedans. And he planted the standard of the Cross in the New World in the following month of October, taking possession of San Salvador, and the other countries which he subsequently discovered, in the name of the Spanish sovereigns.

On the return of Columbus to Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella immediately despatched ambassadors to Rome, to

---

[1] Mariana, *History of Spain*, xxvi., c. 2. Some maintain that these children were born before he became an ecclesiastic; while others say that they were the children of a deceased brother of whom he was appointed guardian. The historical evidence, however, against the writers who seek to justify Alexander on either of these grounds appears to be too strong. See Jungmann, vi. 446-493; and the *Civilta Cattolica*, Series viii., vol. ix., 718.

[2] *De Vitis Pontiff. Rom.*, 357.

[3] So called from a famous Florentine explorer named Amerigo Vespucci († 1512), who made three voyages to the New World between 1499 and 1508

have their claims to the territories already discovered, as well as to those that should be afterwards discovered in their name, recognised by the Holy See. Alexander replied by issuing the Bull *Eximiae devotionis*,[1] on the 4th of May, 1493, granting to the Spanish sovereigns rights over the newly discovered territories in the West similar to those already granted by the Holy See[2] to the kings of Portugal over the territories discovered in their name in Western Africa. To prevent the occurrence of a conflict between the sovereigns of the two countries on account of future discoveries, he issued on the following day his famous Bull *Inter Cetera*,[3] commonly known as the *Bull of Partition*. In this Bull, while confirming the grant made in the previous one, he drew a line[4] from north to south, a hundred miles to the west of the C. Verde Islands, stipulating that all discoveries made to the west of that line should belong to Spain, and that all those lying to the east should belong to Portugal. He required that the Spanish sovereigns should endeavour to propagate Christianity in their newly discovered dominions.

Alexander's grant to the Spanish sovereigns.

His Bull of Partition (1493).

The purpose of this and similar Bulls was not, as asserted by Protestant writers, and maintained by a few Catholic theologians during the Middle Ages, to transfer

---

[1] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad. an. 1493, n. xviii.

[2] Nicholas V. confirmed (1454) Alphonsus V. of Portugal in those possessions he had disaovered in Western Africa. The grant was renewed by Calixtus III. in 1456, and still later by Sixtus IV. in 1481. Hergenröther, *The Catholic Church and Christian State* (Eng. ed.), vol. ii., 154.

[3] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1493, nn. xix.-xxii.

[4] The map on which the line was drawn is still preserved in Rome. By the Treaty of Tordesillas, concluded in the course of the following year between Spain and Portugal, the line of demarcation was removed to 370 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands. Prescott, *Hist, of Ferdinand and Isabella* (4th ed.), ii. 164.

The purpose and nature of the Bull.

ownership from infidels to Christians, but simply to protect the possessions of Christian princes from invasion by other Christians. The grant made by Alexander to the Spanish sovereigns was merely prospective, and presupposed the conditions that the possessions protected by it should be acquired by a just title. This condition, which is understood in the Bull *Inter Cetera*, is expressed in another Bull[1] issued four years later by the same Pope confirming the King of Portugal in his African possessions, Hergenröther, writing on this grant, says:[2] "No Pope has ever taught, nor has any grave theologian ever maintained, that the Pope has authority to bestow the dominions of unbelieving princes upon believers merely at his own discretion, and to give away at will lands not belonging to him. The Bull *Inter Cetera* of Alexander VI., which is specially cited in proof of this claim, was by no means intended to partition the world, but to direct the course of Spanish ships, to hinder disputes between Christian princes, especially between Spain and Portugal; and, on the other hand, to secure the spread of Christianity. In all matters concerning the acquisition of territory and voyages of discovery made by Christian kingdoms, the Pope, as their recognised arbiter, had the right of decision; and in matters concerning the spread of Christianity in newly discovered lands he had the same right as Head of the Church."

Dispute about the Neapolitan crown.

The death of Ferdinand of Naples, in 1494, gave rise to a struggle for the vacant crown, in which Alexander was obliged to take a prominent part. It was claimed by

---

[1] Raynaldus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1497, n. xxxiii.

[2] *The Catholic Church and Christian State*, vol. ii., 149-150.

Ferdinand's son, Alphonsus, in right of his father; while Charles VIII. of France laid claim to it as the representative of the House of Anjou.[1] The Pope at first took the side of the former; but the arrival of Charles in Rome, in 1495, at the head of a large army compelled him to change sides. A treaty[2] was concluded by which Alexander agreed to acknowledge Charles King of Naples, to hand over to him some fortresses in the Papal States till he should get possession of the kingdom, to pardon those cardinals who had taken his side, and to grant him possession of the Turkish Prince Zizim[3] for the purpose of a crusade.

Treaty between Alexander and Charles VIII. of France.

Charles succeeded shortly afterwards in establising his authority over the kingdom of Naples. His tyrannical government, however, soon estranged the affections of his new subjects. Alexander, taking advantage of his unpopularity, entered into a league with the Emperor of Germany, the Doge of Venice, and the Duke of Milan, for the expulsion of the French from Italy. Shortly after the departure of Charles from Naples, in 1495, Ferdinand II., the son of Alphonsus, was restored to the throne of his father.

Restoration of Ferdinand III. to his father's throne.

Alexander's great desire throughout his pontificate appeared to be to raise his children to positions of wealth and honour.[4] For his eldest son, John, he procured from the King of Spain the title of Duke of Gandia, and bestowed on him a portion of the kingdom of Naples and the duchy of Benevento, which he detached from the

Alexander's efforts to promote the interests of his children, &c.

---

[1] Ciaconius, *Vitae et Res Gestae Pont. Rom.*, iii. 149.

[2] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1495, n. i.

[3] He died shortly afterwards, his death being commonly ascribed to poison. *Ibidem*, n. vii.

[4] Panvinius, *De Vitis Pont. Rom.*, 359

States of the Church. Immediately after his elevation he bestowed his own see of Valencia on Caesar, and shortly afterwards raised him to the cardinalate; but on the death of John,[1] in 1497, Caesar[2] was released from his ecclesiastical obligations to enable him to succeed to the titles and possessions of his deceased brother. He brought about a marriage between his youngest son, Geoffrey, and a daughter of Alphonsus of Naples. And, finally, he had Lucretia[3] married with great pomp in the Vatican to Alexander Sforza, nephew of the Duke of Milan.

Opposition to Alexander.

The excessive attachment and favour shown by Alexander to his children and other relatives, created for him much enmity at Rome and throughout Italy. Unfortunately his conduct[4] before he became Pope, and his neglect during his pontificate to stamp out different abuses that prevailed in the Papal court, gave his enemies an ample opportunity of assailing his character.[5]

[1] It was generally supposed that he was murdered at the instigation of his brother Caesar.

[2] For a description of his character, see Roscoe, *Life of Leo X.* (4th ed.), ii. 32-34.

[3] She has been charged by some writers with having been the very personification of wickedness. For a complete vindication of her character, see Roscoe, *Life of Leo X.*, pages 359-377.

[4] Most of the charges against Alexander's character rest on the authority of Burchard († 1505), master of ceremonies in the Papal chapel from 1483 to 1505. In his diary, a portion of which was published by Leibnitz, in 1696, the writer never misses an opportunity of chronicling whatever would appear discreditable to Alexander. In order to know what value is to be attached to his statements, we must bear in mind that he is described by Paris de Grassis, his successor in the office of master of ceremonies in Rome, as "non solum non humanus, sed supra omnes bestias bestialissimus, inhumanissimus, invidiosissimus." *Diarium*, Ad an. 1506. The masters of ceremonies about this time considered it part of their duty to keep a memorandum of what occurred in the Papal palace.

[5] For charge alleged against him of having been the cause of his own death by taking a poisoned cup which he had intended for another, see Roscoe, i. 348.

Among those who publicly denounced him as unworthy of his exalted office, the eloquent Dominican Savonarola holds the foremost place. This remarkable man was born of noble parents at Ferrara, in 1452. At an early age he acquired a taste for philosophy and theology, and joined the Dominicans at Bologna, in 1474. Here he went through his novitiate, and completed his ecclesiastical studies.

Savonarola

Became a Dominican (1474).

Savonarola made his first public appearance in the monastery of St. Mark, in Florence, as the Lenten preacher for the year 1482. His maiden effort turned out to be a miserable failure. His voice was so harsh, and his delivery so bad, that his church was soon deserted, and he was obliged to interrupt the course of instructions which he had undertaken. He was not, however, disheartened by his failure. He withdrew to a house of his Order at Brescia, where he laboured indefatigably to overcome his defects as a preacher.

His first public appearance in Florence (1482)

Savonarola returned to Florence in 1489, and undertook to preach the Lenten sermons for that year. His second appearance in that city was as remarkable for his success as the first had been for his failure. The fame of his eloquence spread throughout Italy, and his church was soon unable to accommodate the numbers that flocked to hear him. He denounced in unsparing terms the wickedness of his age, and indulged freely in prophetical allusions to the punishments that were to visit sin in the immediate future.

His second public appearance (1489).

He was elected superior of the monastery in 1491, after which he continued to inveigh with renewed vigour against the vices of the times, and openly attacked the Government of Florence for fostering the excessive study

Elected prior of St. Mark's (1491).

of Greek and Latin literature, which proved to be dangerous alike to faith and morals.

New Government established in Florence 1494.

The opposition aroused against the Medici, who were the political leaders in Florence, by the preaching of Savonarola, as well as by an unpopular treaty which they concluded, in 1494, with Charles VIII. of France, led to their immediate expulsion from the city. A new government was established, in which Savonarola, though holding no official position, was the leading spirit. Its constitution was based on the law of the Gospel. Stringent laws were enacted against vice and sin; vanities of dress were prohibited by severe sumptuary laws; and all bad books and dangerous pictures were committed to the flames.

Reforms in Florence.

The effects of the reforms introduced by Jerome soon "began to appear in the graver dress and more decorous manners both of men and women; in church-going, fasting, and almsgiving; in the celebration of marriages with seriousness, instead of the levity which had been usual; in habits of family devotion which were almost monastic; in the restoration of wrongful or questionable gains; and in the reading of religious books, and the substitution of hymns for the licentious and half-pagan carnival songs of former times, some of which had been composed by Lorenzo himself." [1]

Hostility towards Savonarola.

Savonarola raised up against himself by his preaching many dangerous enemies. He aroused the hostility of the Medici and their followers by destroying their political power in Florence, and of the secular and religious clergy by denouncing their shortcomings in unmeasured terms.

[1] Rob. viii. 281

He was accused to Alexander of being a visionary and a heretic; and was summoned, in 1495, to appear at Rome, to answer the charges alleged against him. Having refused to obey the citation, he was prohibited to preach. He obeyed the Papal injunction for a short time; but he soon began to preach again, saying that he had to obey God rather than man. He openly assailed the Pope for his wickedness; and he appealed to the princes of Europe to assist in convening a General Council to depose him as an intruder and a simoniac. Alexander, finding that his orders had been contemned and his authority set at naught by the Florentine friar, pronounced sentence of excommunication against him on the 12th of May, 1497.

His excommunication (May 12, 1497)

Shortly after his excommunication two events occurred which destroyed his influence in Florence. A conspiracy having been formed for the restoration of the Medici to power, five of its organizers were condemned to death, and executed without being allowed to appeal to the Great Council of the nation. This was a direct violation of the Constitution, and destroyed all confidence in the integrity of the government of which Savonarola was considered the guiding spirit. And about six months later he refused a challenge to an ordeal of fire given to him by a Franciscan named Francis of Apulia, which completely discredited him with the Florentines.

He is completely discredited at Florence.

Two days after Savonarola's refusal to accept the challenge of his Franciscan opponent, the monastery of St. Mark was besieged by a mob (April 11, 1498). Having been arrested, he was brought before a commission appointed to try him. The Pope asked that he should be sent to Rome, in order that the charges against him should

His trial and death (1498).

be fully investigated. With this request the Florentine magistrates refused to comply. Alexander then sent the General of the Dominicans and a bishop to preside at the trial in his name. Savonarola was declared guilty, and was committed to the flames on the 23rd of May, 1498.

Julius II. (1503-13).

On the death of Pius III., who reigned only twenty-six days, the cardinals elected Cardinal Julius della Rovere, who took the name of Julius II. The new Pope, who had been a mariner in his earlier life, was created cardinal in 1471, by his uncle, Sixtus IV. He was straightforward in all his dealings, a hater of nepotism, and a liberal patron of the arts.[1]

The League of Cambray (1508).

He took a more prominent part in Italian politics than any of his predecessors, and showed throughout his pontificate that he possessed more of the qualities of the soldier than of the churchman. He compelled Caesar Borgia to restore to the Papal States the territories granted to him by Alexander VI. He entered into a league, known as the League of Cambray (1508), with Maximilian of Germany, Louis XII. of France, and Ferdinand of Naples; and thereby compelled the Venetians to restore (1509) the Adriatic possessions of the Holy See, which they had seized. The kings who had assisted to bring about this result were repaid by getting some of the territories of the Venetian Republic.

On the conclusion of peace between the Holy See and

[1] Under him was commenced (1506) St. Peter's. Its first architect was Bramante († 1514). Each of his successors, Peruzzi and San Gallo, proposed a new design of his own. It was not till Michael Angelo († 1564), celebrated as an architect, painter, and sculptor, got charge of it, in 1546, that much progress was made. The building of this noble temple extended over more than a hundred years, and was finally dedicated by Urban VIII. in 1628.

the Venetians, Louis XII., who had come into Italy at the head of a large army to assist in reducing the latter, wished to continue the war with the obvious intention of extending the power of the French crown in Italy. Julius, however, forbade him to continue the war, upon which he retaliated by assisting the Duke of Ferrara, a vassal of the Holy See, to assert his independence. The Pope warned him to break off this alliance with a rebellious vassal of the Holy See. Having refused to obey, he was excommunicated on the 9th of August, 1510. The Pope forthwith entered into a new league, known as the Holy League, with Spain, England, and Switzerland, for the purpose of opposing the ambitious schemes of the French King in Italy.

The Holy League (1510).

Louis held an assembly of the French clergy at Tours, in August, 1510, to consider the conduct of Julius. They gave their opinion that the Pope had no right to wage war against Christian kings; and that, if he did, the censures pronounced by him against his opponents might be disregarded. They suggested that a General Council, which the Pope should be asked to convoke, would be the best means of settling the quarrel; and that, if the Pope refused to convoke the Council, the duty of doing so would devolve on others.

Council of Tours.

Julius, having refused to comply with the request of the King of France and the Emperor of Germany, to convoke a Council, three cardinals who took the side of Louis summoned the bishops of Christendom to meet at Pisa, on the 1st of September, 1511. Here the Conventicle opened on the day appointed. There were present four or five cardinals, fifteen bishops, and a large number of inferior clergy, nearly all being from France. After holding three

The Schismatical Conventicle of Pisa (1511-12).

Sessions the fathers were obliged by some disturbance at Pisa to withdraw to Milan, where they held five Sessions, and pronounced sentence of deposition against Julius. Being compelled by the forces of the Holy League to withdraw from Milan, the rebellious ecclesiastics removed at first to Asti, and afterwards to Lyons, where the Conventicle was finally dissolved in 1512. On account of the conduct of Louis and his ecclesiastical adherents, France was laid under interdict on the 21st of July, 1512.

THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL OF LATERAN (1512-17).

Its Convocation.

Julius had promised before his election, and immediately afterwards, that he would convoke a General Council within two years. The troubles, however, in which he was involved during the greater portion of his pontificate rendered it impossible for him to fulfil his promise. He addressed letters to the Christian world on the 18th of July, 1511, replying to the charge alleged against him by the rebellious cardinals of having neglected to keep the promises he made in conclave, and convoking a General Council to meet at Rome on the 19th of April, 1512.

The Council opens (May 3, 1512).

The Council opened on the 3rd of May, 1512, and continued till the 16th of March, 1517. At the first Session, which was held on the 10th of May, under the presidency of Julius II., there were present fifteen cardinals, seventy-nine bishops, and a large number of abbots and doctors.[1]

Held for a triple purpose.

The Council was held for the three-fold purpose of terminating the schism, of condemning errors against faith, and of passing reformatory decrees.

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 1582. The number of bishops afterwards increased to one hundred and twenty.

Five Sessions held during pontificate of Julius II.

Of the twelve General Sessions held during the continuation of the Council, the first three were devoted to condemning the acts of the Conventicle of Pisa. The Emperor of Germany, who had for a time taken the side of Louis of France, sent ambassadors to Rome, who appeared at the third Public Session (December 3), and expressed the adhesion of their master to the Council.[1] At the fourth Session, held a week later, the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was condemned. And at the fifth Session, held on the 16th of February, 1513, the Council approved of a decree[2] issued by Julius eight years previously, declaring Papal elections in which simony would intervene invalid, and pronouncing various penalties against such cardinals as would be guilty of it. A week later Julius II. passed to his reward.

Seven Sessions held during pontificate of Leo X.

The remaining seven Sessions of the Council were held during the pontificate of Leo X. (1513-1521). The Pope presided at the sixth Session, held on the 27th of April, 1513, and issued a Bull expressing his determination to continue the Council, and urging all bishops to attend. Three committees were appointed (June 3) consisting of cardinals, bishops, and other ecclesiastics, of which the first was to treat of matters relating to the peace of Christendom and the extirpation of the schism; the second, of questions of doctrine; and the third, of general reform.[3]

Immediately after Leo's accession, Louis of France was reconciled with the Holy See. The Pope agreed to

---

[1] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 1626.

[2] *Ibidem*, 1655. This constitution would appear to favour the opinion of those who maintain that the election of Alexander VI. was simoniacal.

[3] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, ix. 1682.

The King of France reconciled with the Holy See.

absolve all ecclesiastics who had taken his side during the recent quarrel, on their expressing regret for their past conduct. And at a meeting held (1515) at Mantua between Leo and Francis, Louis' successor, a concordat was concluded annulling the Pragmatic Sanction, This concordat was approved by the Council[1] on the 19th of December, 1516.

Enactments of the Council.

The enactments of the fathers were published by Julius II. and Leo X. in the form of Bulls, "with the approval of the Council."[3] Among the disciplinary decrees may be mentioned those prohibiting a plurality of benefices, the excessive study of the ancient classics, and the printing of books without the permission of the ordinary of the diocese, or of one authorized by him to give the necessary permission. The Council condemned the erroneous teaching of some students of pagan philosophy,[3] who maintained that the human soul is mortal, and that the same proposition can be theologically true and philosophically false.

---

[1] *Ibidem*, 1682.

[2] "Sacro approbante Concilio."

[3] Spondanus, *Annales*, Ad an. 1513, nn. xix. xx

CHAPTER XXI.

HERETICAL SECTS OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

THE chief heretical sects of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were the Wicliffites and the Hussites. They resembled each other very closely, and were chiefly distinguished by their opposition to the Papacy and their teaching about private judgment. As they laid down the fundamental doctrines of the so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century, they have been generally spoken of by Protestant writers as "the Reformers before the reformation." Their general character.

A.—*The Wicliffites.*

John Wicliffe, to whom this sect owes its origin, as well as its name, was born near Richmond, in Yorkshire, in the year 1324. At the age of sixteen he was sent to Oxford, where he applied himself with great earnestness to the study of philosophy, theology, and canon law. Shortly after his ordination as priest he was appointed warden of Balliol College, about 1360. He was, however, shortly afterwards dismissed from this office by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the charter of foundation required that it should be filled by a religious. Wicliffe appealed to the Pope against the action of the Archbishop; but without effect. According to many, it was this that *John Wicliffe.* Dismissed from Wardenship of Balliol College.

embittered his mind against ecclesiastical authority in general and the Papacy in particular.[1]

He commences to lecture in Oxford.

About the year 1363 he took the degree of doctor of divinity at Oxford, and commenced to lecture publicly in the University. From the very commencement of his career as lecturer, he showed the spirit of the pseudo-reformer by assailing the doctrines and practices of the Church. He was a most determined opponent of the Mendicants, whom he described as the curse of Christendom. And in the controversy between the Papacy and Edward III., regarding the tribute payable by England to the Holy See, he took the side of the King. His well-known antipathy to the claims of Rome secured his appointment as one of the commissioners sent to Bruges, in 1374, to settle the points in dispute[2] between the Holy See and the English parliament. On his return to England he openly attacked the Papal Court, and spoke of the Pope as "antichrist, the proud worldly priest of Rome."

His opposition to the Papacy and Mendicants.

Summoned before a Synod held at St. Paul's 1377).

Wicliffe was summoned by Courtenay, Bishop of London, to appear before a synod, held at St. Paul's, in 1377, to answer the charges[3] of heterodoxy alleged against him. Wicliffe obeyed the citation. But, owing to the interference of John of Gaunt, son of Edward III., and Lord Percy, who appeared as the champions of the accused, as well as to a tumult caused by a London mob, the synod broke up without taking any action against Wicliffe.

When Gregory XI. heard of the result of the London

[1] Lingard, *History of England*, iii. 267.

[2] Wilkins, *Conc. Brit. et Hib.*, iii. 97.

[3] For nineteen charges alleged against him, see Wilkins, *Conc Brit. et Hib.*, iii. 123.

synod, he addressed letters[1] to the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the university authorities, reproving their remissness, and urging them to proceed at once against the heresiarch. It was, no doubt, owing to these letters that Wicliffe was again summoned to appear before a synod, held (1378) in Lambeth Palace; but he was dismissed merely with a warning to desist from his heretical preaching.

Appears at Lambeth Palace (1378).

The action of the ecclesiastical authorities appears to have had but the effect of encouraging Wicliffe to pursue his schismatical career more openly. To secure the propagation of his opinions, as well as to combat the influence of the Mendicants, he instituted his society of "poor priests," who went through the country barefooted and poorly clad inveighing against the abuses of the clergy and assailing the doctrines of the Church.

His society of "poor priests."

The rising of the populace in rebellion under Wat Tyler, in 1381, which, if not originated[2] by the revolutionary teaching of Wicliffe, was at least favoured by it, brought home to the authorities, both ecclesiastical and civil, the dangerous character of his errors. He was summoned by Courtenay, who had been recently appointed primate, to appear before a synod of eight bishops and fourteen doctors, held in London. Here ten propositions taken from his writings were condemned as heretical, and twelve as erroneous.[3] This led to his expulsion from Oxford. He spent the last days of his life in his parish of

Condemnation of the teaching (1382).

His death (1384)

[1] *Ibidem*, 116-118.

[2] One of the leaders of the insurrectionary movement, a priest named John Ball, declared that he had been for two years a follower of Wicliffe, whom he described as the cause of the revolt.

[3] Wilkins, *Conc. Brit. et Hib.*, iii. 157.

Lutterworth, which had been conferred on him by the crown in 1375. Here he died, in 1384, from a stroke of apoplexy, by which he was attacked while attending at Mass.

His writings

His chief writing were his *Trialogus*, so called because it is written in the form of a trialogue between Aletheia (Truth), Pseustis (Falsehood), and Phronesis (Thoughtfulness); and his *English Translation of the Bible*. This was not, as so often asserted by Protestant writers, the first translation of the Bible known in England. For Sir Thomas More assures us in his *Dialogue*[1] that it had been translated into English "by virtuous and well-learned men" long before the heresiarch of Lutterworth was heard of. And Wicliffe himself says,[2] in his preface to the English version, that in undertaking the work of translation he was but following the example of the Venerable Bede, Alfred the Great, and other holy men.

His errors.

His theological and philosophical errors[3] are mostly contained in his *Trialogus*:—(*a*) he taught the doctrine of Pantheism; (*b*) he defended absolute predestination; (*c*) he maintained that the written word of God interpreted by reason is the sole rule of faith; (*d*) he rejected transubstantiation;[4] (*e*) he denied the necessity of absolution for those who elicit an act of perfect contrition; (*f*) priests in the state of mortal sin cannot validly administer the sacraments; (*g*) the Papacy should be abolished as an institution of Satan; and (*h*) influenced by his ideas

[1] iii. 14.

[2] See Lewis's Introduction to *Wicliffe's New Testament*.

[3] Forty-five errors extracted from his writings were condemned by the Council of Constance.

[4] According to some (*v.g.*, Jungmann, vi. 326) he also rejected the Real Presence. The terms, however, of his confession, quoted by Lingard (*History of England*, iii. 308), appear to show that he was orthodox on this point.

of feudalism, he taught that civil rulers by the commission of mortal sin lost all authority, mortal sin being a rebellion against God, from whom all authority comes; and that their subjects could punish them, and, if necessary, depose them.

The Lollards.

Wicliffe's followers were known by the name of Lollards.[1] They became daily more aggressive and threatening in their attitude towards the clergy. In 1394 they affixed to the door of St. Paul's a placard denouncing the ministers of the Church and their doctrines, and presented a petition to Parliament demanding the suppression of what they called the errors and superstitious practices of Rome. Influenced by the defiant conduct of the sectaries, as well as by the appeals of the clergy for protection, the English Parliament enacted the well-known statute, *De haeretico comburendo*, in 1401, which ordered that anyone pronounced guilty of heresy by the ecclesiastical courts should be handed over to the civil power and publicly burned. Many were put to death in virtue of this statute, the first being an heretical London priest named William Sautre. This and subsequent enactments passed against the Lollards were enforced with so much severity by Henry V. (1413-22), that the sectaries had almost disappeared from the kingdom before the end of his reign; the most famous of those who suffered being Sir John Oldcastle, better known as Lord Cobham († 1417).

The statute *De haeretico comburendo* (1401).

[1] The name had been previously applied to a benevolent society established in the Netherlands early in the fourteenth century for caring the sick and burying the dead. The word is derived, by some from the German *lullen*, which means to sing softly; and by others, from the Latin *lolium*, a tare. The latter derivation was frequently referred to by the opponents of Wicliffe's followers.

B.—*The Hussites.*

John Huss.

John Huss,[1] the founder of this sect, was born of humble parents at Hussinecz, a village in Bohemia, in 1369.[2] He studied at the University of Prague, recently founded by Charles IV. of Germany, who had been also King of Bohemia. Here he applied himself with great diligence to the study of the sacred sciences, and was appointed to a chair in the university, in 1398. Four years later he became preacher in the Bethlehem Chapel;[3] and, in 1403, he was appointed confessor to the Queen of Bohemia, which secured for him considerable influence at court.

He becomes a follower of Wicliffe.

The theological writings of Wicliffe were surreptitiously introduced[4] into Prague, in 1398,[5] and were soon freely read there, owing to the circulation of a forged document purporting to contain the approval of those writings by the University of Oxford. They appear to have had a special fascination for Huss, by whom portions of the *Trialogus* were translated into the vernacular. He soon began to show in his public preaching a decided Wicliffite tendency; and, about the year 1408, he commenced to assail the clergy in virulent language, and to advance numerous heterodox opinions.

---

[1] Huss means a goose, to which frequent allusion was made by his opponents.

[2] Hefele, *Histoires des Conciles*, x. 330.

[3] It was founded, in 1391, by two wealthy laymen with a view to promote preaching in the Bohemian tongue.

[4] The introduction of Wicliffe's writings was facilitated by the free intercourse recently brought about between England and Bohemia by the marriage of Richard II. to Anne of Bohemia.

[5] Some of the other writings of Wicliffe had been known in Bohemia as early as 1385. See Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, x. 332.

Archbishop Sbinko of Prague, acting on instructions received from Alexander V., forbade (June 16th, 1410) him to preach. Against this prohibition, however, he appealed to John XXIII., the successor of Alexander, and, confident in the influence which he enjoyed at court, continued his preaching pending the decision of the Pope. The Archbishop punished this contempt of ecclesiastical authority by excommunicating (July 18) him and his most prominent followers, the most noteworthy of whom was a layman named Jerome of Prague. The sentence having been confirmed by the Pope, Huss appealed to the judgment of a future General Council. Henceforth Huss became openly schismatical, and publicly assailed various doctrines of the Church.

He is forbidden to preach (1410).

His excommunication.

Notwithstanding the ban of excommunication, Huss continued, owing to the favour of his royal patrons, to pursue his course of open defiance of ecclesiastical authority. The Archbishop laid Prague under interdict in October, 1410, but this had merely the effect of stimulating the Hussites to renewed efforts against the clergy. They publicly burned a Papal Bull in Prague, and caused numerous disturbances in the city.

Prague laid under interdict.

The King at length awoke to the dangerous consequences of Huss's teaching, and took the side of the ecclesiastical authorities in 1412. Huss was consequently obliged to withdraw from Prague, and lived in retirement, protected by those nobles who favoured his opinions. It was during the time of his retirement that he wrote his best known work, *On the Church*, which is little more than a free translation of the *Trialogus*.

Huss withdraws from Prague and writes his *De Ecclesia*.

Huss had frequently appealed to the judgment of a General Council. At length the Council of Constance

He sets out for Constance.

(1414-18) gave him the opportunity which he had so long desired of showing to the world that the charges against his orthodoxy were without foundation. He was prevailed on to go to Constance by the King of Bohemia, who gave him an escort of three knights, and he received a safe-conduct[1] from the Emperor to protect him from all unlawful molestation on his way to Constance and during his stay there.

His arrival there.

Huss arrived at Constance, the 3rd November. In order to give him full freedom pending his trial, John XXIII. absolved him from the sentence of excommunication, and allowed him to live in a private house and move about without restriction, prohibiting him merely to say Mass and to preach. But as he disregarded the restrictions imposed on him, he was placed in honourable confinement on the 18th November.

His condemnation and death (July 6, 1415).

Huss was at length brought up for public trial before a General Congregation of the Council, on the 6th of June, 1415. The trial lasted three days. On the 8th of June he was asked to abjure thirty errors extracted from his writings, which he obstinately refused to do. He was therefore condemned, and, having been degraded by order of the Council, was handed over to the civil authorities, by whom death by burning, the punishment of heresy, was inflicted on the 6th July, 1415.

The Emperor Sigismund has been frequently charged with having violated the terms of his safe-conduct in allowing Huss to be put to death. This charge is based

[1] It was issued at the Diet of Spires on the 18th of October, 1414; but was not delivered to Huss till the 5th of November, two days after his arrival at Constance.

on a complete misunderstanding of what was meant during the Middle Ages by a safe-conduct. Its character must be determined not by modern notions, but by the opinions of those who lived at the time when it was granted.

Sigismund charged with violating his safe-conduct.

The force of the safe-conduct, interpreted in the light of the fifteenth century, was not to guard Huss from condemnation by the Council and its consequences, but merely to protect him from violence on his way to Constance, during his stay there, and on his way back, if he was acquitted. First, this was the opinion of Sigismund himself, as is sufficiently clear from the words addressed by him to Huss on the day before his condemnation: "I have redeemed my promise," said he; "if you obstinately persist in defending your errors, the Council has its rights[1] and laws according to which it must proceed against you. I should rather prepare with my own hands the faggots for your burning than protect your errors." Secondly, the opinion of Sigismund is fully borne out by the whole tenor of the safe-conduct,[2] which shows clearly that it was not intended

The charge considered.

---

[1] It has been alleged by some anti-Catholic writers (*v.g.*, Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.*, Eng. ed., v. 121) that the Council of Constance, in order to satisfy the conscience of the Emperor, passed a decree that no faith was to be kept with heretics. This is merely a misrepresentation of one of the enactments of the Council, viz., that no engagement given by the civil power can interfere with the strict rights of ecclesiastical authority. It is distinctly implied in the decree that a civil prince is bound to keep his promises as far as possible (*quod in ipso est*). Hard., *Coll. Conc.*, viii. 462.

[2] Sigismundus . . . universis et singulis principibus . . . Venerabiles illustres, nobiles et fideles delecti, honorabilem magistrum Joannem Huss sacrae theologiae baccalaureum formatum et artium magistrum, praesentium ostensorem, de regno Bohemiae ad concilium generale in civitate Constantiensi celebrandum in proximo transeuntem, quem etiam in nostram et sacri imperii protectionem recepimus et tutelam, nobis, omnibus et vestrum

to protect Huss from condemnation by the Council. Thirdly, the Bohemian Knights who formed his escort, while they strongly protested against his imprisonment pending his trial, as a violation of the safe-conduct, and bitterly assailed the Council on account of his condemnation, had no word of complaint against the Emperor for having allowed him to be executed. And, fourthly, the execution of Huss was not regarded by his contemporaries[1] as a violation of the imperial safe-conduct.

Jerome of Prague condemned and executed (May 30, 1416).

Jerome of Prague, the most prominent of Huss's followers, was arrested and brought before the Council on the 23rd of May, 1415. He consented to accept a formulary of recantation upon the 23rd of September, upon which he demanded to be set at liberty. His demand having been refused, he publicly defended Huss and his teaching, for which he was condemned and committed to the flames on the 30th of May, 1416.

Utraquism.

When the followers of Huss and Jerome of Prague heard that their leaders had been put to death, they were filled with indignation, and banded themselves together for defensive and offensive purposes under Nicholas of Hussinecz and John Ziska. They demanded that a number of so-called reforms should be introduced, the chief being the administration of Holy Communion under the twofold species to the laity. Though this was not among the

---

cuilibet pleno recommendamus affectu, desiderantes, quatenus ipsum, dum ad vos pervenerit, grate suscipere, favorabiliter tractare, ac in *his quae celeritatem et securitatem ipsius concernunt itineris* tam per terram quam per aquam, promotivam sibi velitis et debeatis ostendere voluntatem, necnon ipsum cum famulis . . . omni prorsus remoto impedimento transire, stare, morari et redire libere permittatis . . . Datum Spirae, A.D. MCCCCXIV., XVIII. die Octobris. Hefele, *Historie des Conciles*, x. 523-24.

[1] Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccles.*, vi. 337.

reforms suggested by Huss, it was placed first on the list by his followers, owing chiefly to the influence of Jacobellus, a professor of philosophy in the University of Prague. Henceforth Utraquism became the watchword of the Hussites.

The Hussite War (1419-34).

The attitude of the Hussites to the Church and State was daily becoming more threatening, till they at length rose in open revolt in 1419, and founded the city of Tabor, about forty-nine miles south-east of Prague. Here communion was administered under two kinds to forty thousand Hussites. During the war which ensued, various atrocities which have been scarcely ever equalled were committed by the insurgents. On the capture of a city all the inhabitants were put to death; priests and monks were massacred in large numbers; and, we are told, that as many as five hundred churches and monasteries were destroyed. The imperial forces assisted by crusaders from other countries appeared powerless to cope with the fanaticism of the rebels.

Hussite atrocities.

The death of their great leader, Ziska, in 1424, was disastrous to the prospects of the Hussites. During his lifetime, his bravery and strength of character kept them united. But when he disappeared they split into four sections, viz., the Calixtines, the Horebites, the Taborites, and the Orphans. The leaders of the two latter were two brothers of the name of Procopius, one being known as the Elder and the other as the Younger.

The Hussites divided into four sections (1424).

Notwithstanding this division, the Utraquists continued their warlike policy till 1433, when the Calixtines and the Horebites were reconciled with the Church and State by the *Compact of Basle*. By this compact the reformatory demands formulated by Ziska were conceded with certain

The *Compact of Basle* (1433).

restrictions—(*a*) the word of God was to be freely preached, but subject to ecclesiastical authority; (*b*) mortal sin was to be punished, but by a lawful tribunal; (*c*) Communion under both kinds was to be given to adults who demanded it and admitted that Christ was wholly present under each species; and (*d*) the clergy, while retaining their temporalities, were to apply their superfluous wealth to the charitable purposes specified in canon law.

The *Compact of Iglau* (1436).

The Taborites and Orphans, who refused to accept the *Compact of Basle*, continued the war till 1434, when they suffered an overwhelming defeat at the battle of Bohmishod. Negotiations were immediately afterwards opened between them and the victors. The negotiations ended in the great majority of the rebellious Hussites accepting the *Compact of Iglau* (1436), which was similar to the *Compact of Basle*. Some of them, however, refusing all offers of reconciliation, receded more and more every day from the teaching of the Church, and formed themselves into an independent community known as the Moravian Brethren. Many of these sectaries shortly afterwards abandoned their errors, owing to the preaching (1451-53) of St. John of Capistran.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE CONDITION OF RELIGION IN THE BRITISH ISLES DURING THIS EPOCH.

A.—*In England.*

A GREAT change came over the religious and political condition of England about the beginning of this epoch. The Normans invaded the country in 1066, under their leader, William the Conqueror, and by the Battle of Hastings, fought the same year, established their supremacy over the Anglo-Saxons. They treated the vanquished as an inferior race, excluded them from all offices of trust and emolument in the Church and State, and condemned their language and the characters in which it was written as barbarous, French being made the language of the law courts and of all official documents.

Invasion of England by the Normans (1066).

The Norman invasion had a beneficial effect on the civilization and religious condition of England.[1] The chief ecclesiastical benefices of the country were filled by foreigners, distinguished alike for piety and learning, who continued the labours of Canute and Edward the Confessor for the reformation of those abuses that had crept into the English Church during the Danish wars.

Its effect on religion and civilization.

The most remarkable of the ecclesiastics introduced into England by the Conqueror was Lanfranc. He was born

[1] Lingard, *History of England*, ii. 55-59; *Cambrensis Eversus*, translated and edited by Dr. Kelly, ii. 454, 455.

Lanfranc (1005-89).

at Pavia, in Lombardy, in the year 1005. Having received his early education in his native city, he completed his studies at Bolegna, and practised for a time as a lawyer, at first in Pavia, and afterwards in France. On one occasion, while travelling near Bec, he was attacked by a band of robbers by whom he was so maltreated that life appeared to be almost extinct, On recovering consciousness he was directed to the neighbouring monastery, where he was kindly received by the monks, and soon recovered from the effects of the recent attack.

Takes the religious habit (1042).

He was so impressed with what he saw at Bec that he took the religious habit in that monastery in 1042. He soon won for himself golden opinions among his companions, and was appointed to the office of prior in 1045. Eighteen years later he was transferred to the abbacy of the newly-founded monastery of St. Stephen, at Caen, from which he was promoted, in 1070, to the see of Canterbury.

Appointed to the see of Canterbury (1070).

During the twenty years of his episcopate he laboured indefatigably to stamp out abuses among the English clergy, and to promote the interests of religion and education. In his reformatory labours he received the ready co-operation of William the Conqueror.

Practice of investiture introduced into England.

The practice of ecclesiastical investiture introduced into England by the Normans had a far-reaching effect on the subsequent relations between the Church and State in that country. It was used there, as it was used in so many other countries at the time, to destroy the privileges and rights of the clergy and to enslave the Church. It was thus used, especially by William Rufus and Henry II. The former of these, whose name is associated in history with oppression and tyranny, appointed his favourites to the principal ecclesiastical offices in the kingdom; kept

numerous benefices vacant while he appropriated the revenues; and, finally, "degraded the dignities of the Church by prostituting them to the highest bidder."[1]

William Rufus oppresses the Church.

During the early years of his reign, William was somewhat restrained from excesses by the salutary influence which Lanfranc, his former master, exercised over him. But after the primate's death, in 1089, he gave free reins to his passions, and for over three years obstinately refused to allow an archbishop to be appointed to the vacant see.

St. Anselm appointed Archbishop of Canterbury 1093

At length, however, being attacked by a severe fit of illness, in 1093, he formed a resolution to make amends for his past wickedness, and immediately offered the vacant archbishopric to St. Anselm, the learned abbot of Bec. The latter refused to accept the dignity unless the King would undertake to restore the confiscated temporalities of the see, and to recognise Urban II.[2] (1088-99) as lawful Pope. William having expressed his readiness to comply with these conditions, St. Anselm was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury.

William II. renews his opposition to the Church.

As soon as William recovered from his illness he quickly forgot his good resolutions, and returned to his former policy of oppression and of opposition to the Church. He was, for instance, so much carried away by his extravagance as to prevent the Archbishop from holding a synod to reform abuses among the clergy, and even forbade him to go to Rome to receive the pallium. Such unjustifiable conduct resulted, as we should expect, in bringing about a quarrel between the King and the Archbishop.

---

[1] Lingard, *History of England*, ii. 16.

[2] There was an antipope at the time, viz., Clement III. (1080-1100), who had been set up by Henry IV. of Germany.

He imposes exorbitant taxes on ecclesiastical property.

A temporary reconciliation was, however, effected between them at an assembly of bishops and nobles held at Rockingham, in the year 1095. But the quarrel was shortly afterwards renewed, because of the excessive taxes imposed by William on Church property to pay his brother the stipulated amount for his possessions in Normandy during his absence in the Holy Land. And he even demanded that the Archbishop as one of his vassals should equip a body of soldiers to be placed at his disposal. The Archbishop having refused to comply with this demand was cited to appear before the King's court.

St. Anselm appeals to Rome 1097).

St. Anselm, being convinced that there was no chance of receiving justice from the royal tribunal, appealed to Rome. After much opposition, the King consented to his leaving the kingdom to lay his case before the Pope. Immediately after the Archbishop's departure (1097) his ecclesiastical property was confiscated and his tenants oppressed by the King.

His reception at Rome.

On his arrival in Rome, St. Anselm was received by Urban II. with every mark of respect due to such a distinguished Churchman. He tendered his resignation to the Pope; but it was not accepted. At the request of Urban, he attended the Council of Bari, held in 1098, to effect a reunion between the Greek and Latin Churches. Here the conduct of the English king came up for consideration. The Pope, acting on the unanimous recommendation of the fathers, was about to excommunicate him; but was prevented from doing so by the earnest request of St. Anselm. The saintly Archbishop shortly afterwards withdrew to Lyons, where he was when he heard of William's death (1100).

At the request of Henry I. (1100-35), William II.'s

successor, who promised to recognise the rights and liberties of the Church, St. Anslem immediately returned to England. The Archbishop was not, however, allowed to remain long in peaceful possession of his see. A fresh cause of quarrel between him and the crown was soon supplied by Henry's refusal to give up his right to ecclesiastical investiture and to the oath of homage which had been recently prohibited by various Councils. The Archbishop set out for Rome in 1103, to get advice as to how he should proceed in the difficult circumstances in which he was placed. As Paschal II. insisted on the strict observance of the ecclesiastical canons, St. Anslem withdrew to Viterbo, and refused to return to England as long as the King maintained his claim to investiture and the oath of homage.

His return to England (1100).

His second visit to Rome (1103).

A reconciliation was effected between Henry and the Archbishop at Bec, in 1106, the King having consented to relinquish his claim to investiture; while the Pope agreed to tolerate the oath of homage till Henry "should come to a better mind." St. Anslem returned forthwith to his diocese, of which he continued to retain undisturbed possession till his death, in 1109.

His reconciliation with Henry I (1106).

The wars that distracted England during the greater part of the reign of Stephen (1135-54)), Henry's successor, had a most baneful effect on the religious and political interests of the country. "Never yet," says[1] the Saxon chronicler, "had more wretchedness been in the land, nor did heathen men ever do worse than they did; for everywhere at times they forbore neither church nor churchman,

England during the reign of Stephen (1135-54).

[1] Quoted by Robertson, v. 255.

but took all the property that was therein, and then burned the church and all together."

Henry II. (1154 89).

On the death of Stephen, the crown passed to Henry II., the first of the Plantagenets. From the very commencement of his reign, he showed that he was determined to follow in the footsteps of his Norman predecessors in seeking to enslave the Church to the State; and sought to justify his pretensions by appealing to what he was pleased to call the *Ancient Customs of the Realm*, under cover of which he might urge any claim, no matter how extravagant. In carrying out his policy of opposition to the rights and liberties of the Church, he came into conflict with St. Thomas à Becket. It is this conflict that has given Henry his unenviable prominence in Church history.

St. Thomas à Becket.

St. Thomas[1] was born of pious and respectable parents, named Gilbert and Matilda,[2] in London, in the year 1118. He received his elementary education at Merton, in Surrey; and afterwards studied theology at Oxford and Paris. In 1143, he was introduced into the household of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he appears to have been related.[3] He shortly afterwards went to the Continent to complete his ecclesiastical studies in the famous law schools of Bologna and Auxerre.

On his return to England (1154), he was ordained deacon by Theobald, and appointed to the archdeaconry of

[1] Accounts of his life, martyrdom, and miracles, have been handed down to us by at least ten contemporary writers, most of whom were his intimate friends, and witnessed the events which they chronicled. Their biographical writings have been recently fully published in the Rolls Series, under the title of *Material for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*.

[2] For the legend representing her as a Saracen whom Gilbert met in the Holy Land, see Morris, *Life of St. Thomas Becket* (2nd ed.), page 3.

[3] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 446.

Canterbury, "the richest benefice, after the bishoprics, in England."[1] He was employed by the Archbishop on various important missions, in the discharge of which he gave ample proof of his great ability and administrative tact.

Appointed Archdeacon of Canterbury

On the recommendation of Theobald, St. Thomas was appointed Lord Chancellor by Henry, in 1155, and thus held the highest civil position in the kingdom after the king. In his new office, the duties of which were both numerous and arduous, he won the esteem and respect of all with whom he was brought in contact by his courtly manners and accomplished statesmanship. He was the constant companion of the King, except in the royal debaucheries, which he carefully avoided.[2] The silence of his bitterest enemies is the best proof that can be given of his stainless morals. He was munificently liberal in his hospitalities, lived in princely grandeur, and was king in all but name. To his successful administration, as well as to the wise and prudent advice which he gave the King, is generally ascribed the peaceful and contented state of England during the early portion of Henry's reign.

Appointed Lord Chancellor (1155).

While he was Chancellor of England he sometimes took an active part in the wars in which Henry engaged. Thus, he appeared at the head of a body of six hundred knights in the expedition undertaken by the King to assert his claim to the dominions of the Count of Toulouse, and was foremost in every feat of valour. For this he has been severely criticized by many writers, the bearing of arms being completely at variance with his clerical

Censured for having taken part in warfare.

---

[1] *Ibidem*, 447.

[2] Herbert of Bosham, *Vitae S. Thomae*, lib. ii., cap. 2.

character. In justice, however, to St. Thomas, we must remember that it was by no means unusual at the time for even bishops to appear in battle at the head of their troops. He could, therefore, appeal in defence of his conduct to the example of his ecclesiastical superiors.

He sided with the King in opposition to the Church.

St. Thomas has also been blamed for taking the side of Henry II. in his course of opposition to the rights and liberties of the Church. The only reply which John of Salisbury could make to this charge was that, if, with Saul, St. Thomas persecuted the Church, he was afterwards prepared, with St. Paul, to die for it. His conduct, however, can be easily explained without implying any stain on his character. For he fairly considered that by his position he was bound to support the King as long as his conduct was tolerated by the bishops, who were the natural guardians of the Church's privileges.[1] It was this fidelity to the interests of Henry, as far as conscience would permit, that endeared him so much to his royal master.

Henry resolves to have his Chancellor appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.

The death of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1161, gave Henry an opportunity of showing the high esteem in which he held his Chancellor. Though the King appears to have immediately fixed on St. Thomas for the vacant see, he did not make known his intention for about a year. At length, in 1162, Henry, who was at the time staying in Normandy, commissioned his Chancellor to go to England, to look after the interests of the kingdom; and, before his departure, informed him that he was to be the future primate. St. Thomas, who fully realised the responsibilities and difficulties of the office, used all his efforts to dissuade the King from carrying out his intention.

[1] Jungmann, *Dissert. in Hist. Eccl.*, v. 161.

He even went so far as to upbraid the King with his opposition to the Church, and declared that if he became archbishop, he could not tolerate such conduct.

Election and Consecration of St. Thomas (1162),

Henry, who looked on these protestations as mere pretences, recommended St. Thomas to the choice of the monks of Canterbury. The latter, though opposed to the King's nominee, whom they considered unsuited for the twofold office of prior and archbishop, on account of the manner of life he had been leading, gave him their votes. The choice of the monks having been shortly afterwards confirmed by the provincial bishops, St. Thomas was consecrated bishop on Trinity Sunday (1162), having received the order of priesthood on the previous day.

He enters on a new course of life.

His change of office brought with it an immediate change in his mode of life. He put on the habit of a monk, wearing beneath his habit a hair shirt; he spent most of his time in prayer, study, and the practice of various austerities; he was boundless in his charities to the poor; and, finally, he resigned the chancellorship, that he might give his undivided attention to the duties of his sacred office. The resignation of the chancellorship gave great offence to the King, who looked on it as a severance of the bond of friendship that had so long existed between himself and St. Thomas.

He resigns the Chancellorship.

He resolves to defend the liberties of the Church.

The resignation, however, of the chancellorship did not lead to an open rupture between the King and the Archbishop. The open rupture was to come; but it was owing to another cause. From the very commencement of his episcopate St. Thomas showed his determination to defend the rights and liberties of the Church against all encroachments. In adopting this course he was actuated by a "stern sense of duty which crushed his natural

affections, as vulgar ambition must have pointed out a more sure and safe way to power and fame."[1] It was this opposition to the royal pretensions that led to the quarrel between the King and the Archbishop.

Immediate occasion of the quarrel between himself and Henry.

The immediate occasion of the quarrel was the refusal of the Archbishop to allow charges against ecclesiastics to be tried by the civil tribunals of the country. It had been the ancient law of England, approved even by Stephen, Henry's predecessor, that clerics should be tried by ecclesiastical courts alone. This was known as the *Privilege of the Forum*, which was recognised at the time throughout most of Christendom. Henry considered that ecclesiastical tribunals were too lenient in dealing with criminals, and resolved to transfer the hearing of charges against clerics to the civil courts. He asked the Archbishop to degrade an ecclesiastic who had been accused of a grave offence, in order that he might be punished according to the law of the kingdom. With this demand the Archbishop refused to comply, for he felt that it was but the beginning of Henry's efforts to bring about the complete enslavement of the Church.

He defends the *Privilege of the Forum*.

He excommunicates a chief vassal of the crown.

St. Thomas further incensed the King by excommunicating one of the chief vassals of the crown for having expelled a priest from a benefice to which he had been canonically appointed. This was maintained by Henry to have been a violation of the *Royal Customs*, which he said forbade the excommunication of any of his tenants without his consent.

---

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii. 457.

[2] Thus the following enactment was issued by Frederick II. of Germany:—"Statuimus ut nullus ecclesiasticam personam, in criminali quaestione vel civili, trahere ad judicium praesumat." Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. 226.

Council of Westminster (1163).

For the purpose of settling the differences between the King and Archbishop, a council of bishops and nobles was held at Westminster in 1163. The King demanded—(*a*) that an officer of the crown should sit with the Archdeacon while hearing charges against ecclesiastics; and (*b*) that clerics guilty of the graver crimes should be degraded, and handed over to the civil tribunals for punishment. These demands appeared reasonable at first to nearly all the bishops except St. Thomas. The latter, however, who knew Henry's character thoroughly, felt that his proposals were merely the precursors to further measures against the privileges of the clergy. He, therefore, resolved to oppose the King from the very beginning, and soon succeeded in winning over most of the bishops to his side.

St. Thomas opposes the King's demands.

New device of Henry.

On learning of the opposition of the bishops, Henry adopted a clever device to attain his purpose. While professing to abandon his original demands, he asked that the rights accorded to the kings of England by the *Royal Customs* of the kingdom should be approved. "And thus," writes Lingard,[1] the original point in dispute became merged in a more important controversy: for it was evident that under the name of the *Customs* was meditated an attack not on one, but on most of the clerical immunities." The bishops consented to approve the *Customs*, "without detriment to their order or the rights of the Church." The reservation clause proving unacceptable to the King, all the bishops except St. Thomas, yielding to the influence of fear, promised to observe the *Customs* "in good faith." The King, indignant at the opposition of the primate, dismissed the assembly.

St. Thomas refuses to accept the *Royal Customs*.

Various devices were used to shake the resolution of the

[1] *History of England*, ii. 129.

Archbishop. At one time he was threatened with every form of punishment unless he yielded; and at another, the bishops appealed to him to submit for the sake of peace. Again, he was assured that the King required merely a nominal submission, as he would never use his power against the Church; and, finally, an abbot from Normandy appeared before him, saying that he had been sent by the Pope to advise his submission to the King. At length, wearied out by the threats of his enemies and the entreaties of his friends, and deceived by the assurances of the King and the pretended advice of the Pope, St. Thomas had an interview with Henry at Oxford, and promised to observe the *Royal Customs* in "good faith."

He finally yields.

Council of Clarendon (1164).

The King forthwith summoned a Council of the bishops and nobles of the realm to meet at Clarendon to have the *Customs* formulated and solemnly promulgated. The Council met at the appointed place in January, 1164. At the opening of the Council St. Thomas consented, after considerable difficulty, to renew the promise he had already made at Oxford. A commission was then appointed to reduce the *Customs* to written form. They were set forth in sixteen articles known as the *Constitutions*[1] *of Clarendon.*

[1] The following were the chief provisions of these Constitutions:—

(*a*) The revenues of vacant sees were to go to the crown.

(*b*) The consent of the crown was required for holding episcopal elections, and for the departure of an ecclesiastic from the kingdom.

(*c*) Clerics accused of any crime were to be summoned before the king's court, which decided whether the case should be tried by a civil or an ecclesiastical court.

(*d*) Disputes regarding appointments to benefices were to be settled by the king's court.

(*e*) No tenant-in-chief of the crown, nor any member of the royal household, was to be excommunicated without the king's consent.

(*f*) An appeal lay from the archbishop to the king's court, which was to decide whether the case should be referred to Rome or settled in England.

"The Constitutions, which were feudal in form and spirit, aimed at the subjection of all the great prelates of the realm to the crown, to the same extent as the great barons, and subjected the whole of the clergy equally with the laity to the common laws of the land." [1] *Constitutions of Clarendon.*

The Constitutions were signed and sealed by all the bishops except St. Thomas. As soon as the latter realized the extent to which they were opposed to the liberties of the Church, he refused to sign his name or attach his seal. He professed great sorrow for having promised to observe customs of which the Constitutions were said to be the expression; and, as a penance for what he had done, he abstained from saying Mass for a whole month. St. Thomas refuses to approve them.

The King used every effort to secure the primate's submission; but without effect. He even wrote to Rome, asking Alexander III. to confirm the Constitutions. But the Pope, instead of acceding to his request, wrote to the bishops of England, warning them of the dangerous character of the new code of legislation. Henry asks the Pope to confirm them.

Henry II. resolved to have revenge on St. Thomas for his opposition to the Royal Customs. A great Council of the nation was held at Northampton, in October, 1164, before which the Archbishop was cited to appear, to answer the charge of high treason alleged against him. "All England crowded to witness the final strife it might be between the royal and the ecclesiastical power." [1] The trial lasted three days, and ended, as was generally anticipated, in St. Thomas being declared guilty, and his estates forfeited to the crown. The amercement, was, however, commuted into Council of Northampton (Oct. 1164).

---

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 464.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 469.

a fine of £500, which he expressed his readiness to pay for the sake of peace. But Henry, who would rest satisfied with nothing less than his complete ruin, forthwith claimed a balance of 40,000 marks which it was alleged was due to the crown since he was Lord Chancellor. This claim was urged by the King, notwithstanding that his Judiciary Richard de Luci, acting in his name, declared St. Thomas, on becoming Archbishop, released from all obligations he had incurred as Chancellor.

It decides against the Archbishop.

The Archbishop feeling the injustice of the Kings's claim, and being unable to pay the amount, appealed to Rome. Having no security in England, he fled, in the disguise of a monk, to France, where he was kindly received by the King, Louis VII.; and immediately directed his steps to Sens where Alexander III. was then staying. The Pope received him with every mark of affection and esteem, and annulled ten articles of the Constitutions, as being opposed to the interests of the Church. After a short stay at Sens, the Archbishop withdrew to the Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny, in Burgundy, where he remained for two years, living as a simple religious.[1] From his retreat at Pontigny, he Addressed letters of reproof to Henry II., and the English bishops, censuring the former for enforcing the *Constitutions of Clarendon*, and the latter for having deserted the cause of the Church.

He escapes to France.

His residence at Pontigny (1164-66).

The King, being unable to reach the Archbishop, resolved to punish his clerical adherents and relatives. The property of the former was confiscated; while the latter were sent into exile to the number of four hundred, and were

His relatives, &c. punished by Henry.

[1] Hence he has been claimed for two Orders, viz., the Benedictine and the Cistercian. Morris, *Life of Thomas Becket*, 80.

compelled to swear that they would visit Pontigny, and describe to the exiled Archbishop the evils which his opposition to the King had brought about in England.

St. Thomas appointed Papal legate (1165).

The Pope, finding that Henry was determined to enforce the *Constitutions of Clarendon*, openly endorsed the action of the exiled Archbishop, and appointed him Papal Legate to England, in 1165. Using his legatine powers, St. Thomas soon afterwards pronounced various censures, at Vezelay, against the more prominent of Henry's clerical followers.

He removes to Sens (1166).

The King who was indignant at the protection afforded to St. Thomas by the monks of Pontigny, threatened them with the confiscation of all Cistercian property in England, unless they ceased to harbour the Archbishop. When the latter heard that the Cistercians were likely to suffer because of their kindness to him, he immediately withdrew (1166), though not at their request, to Sens, where he was asked by the King of France to take up his abode.

Reconciliation between St. Thomas and Henry.

At length the King of France succeeded in bringing about an interview between Henry and St. Thomas, in 1170. The interview, which took place on the 22nd of July, near Fretivalle, on the borders of Touraine, resulted in the restoration of peace between the King and Archbishop.

St. Thomas returns to England.

St. Thomas immediately set out for England to take possession of his see. But scarcely had he landed in that that country when fresh difficulties arose. He had been recently empowered by the Pope to excommunicate the Archbishop of York and other bishops, for having invaded his rights by crowning Henry's son (June 12, 1170). The Archbishop, however, had intended not to use the special powers which he had received. But as soon as the

He excommunicates the Archbishop of York and other bishops.

offending bishops heard of his reconciliaton with the King and of his arrival in England they despatched soldiers to secure any Papal documents he might have in his possession. St. Thomas succeeded in eluding the vigilance of his enemies. But he felt so incensed at the conduct of the bishops, that he immediately published the censures against them.

The excommunicated bishops appeal to Henry.

The excommunicated bishops immediately directed their steps to Normandy, where Henry was then staying, and denounced the primate as an enemy of kings and a disturber of the public peace. The King, incensed at what he had heard, exclaimed: "Of the cowards who eat at my table, is there no one who will free me from this turbulent priest?" Four knights, who happened to be present, understanding the King's words as a command to murder the Archbishop, set out for England. On their arrival in Canterbury they demanded that the bishops who had been censured should be immediately absolved. The Archbishop having refused to comply with their request, except on the condition that they should submit to condign penance, was martyred on the 29th of December, 1170, within the precincts of the cathedral in which he had taken refuge.

Martyrdom of St. Thomas (Dec 29, 1170).

General indignation against his enemies

The news of St. Thomas's death aroused feelings of indignation throughout Christendom. His personal virtues and exalted station, the dignity and composure with which he met his end, the sacredness of the place, and the cruelty of the assassins, contributed to inspire men with horror for his enemies and respect for the cause he had championed. When Henry heard what had been done by his agents, he was plunged into the deepest melancholy, and shut himself up in his private chamber for three days, refusing to see

anyone, for he felt that the Catholic world would hold him responsible for the murder of the Archbishop.

Alexander III. immediately excommunicated the murderers of St. Thomas, as well as those who had contributed either directly or indirectly to bring about his death. Henry wrote to the Pope, expressing his regret for what had occurred, and his readiness to submit to any penance that might be imposed on him. The sentence of his absolution was publicly pronounced in the Cathedral of Avranches, on the 21st May, 1172, after he had promised to recall the most objectionable articles of the *Constitutions of Clarendon*. This promise he formally carried into effect at a great Council of the nation, held at Northampton, four years later.[1] And thus did St. Thomas accomplish by his death what he had failed to effect during his life.

Murderers of St. Thomas excommunicated

Constitutions of Clarendon annulled (1176)

Towards the end of the twelfth, and early in the thirteenth century, the English Church was somewhat disturbed by the disputes between the monks of Canterbury and the provincial bishops, regarding the right of the latter to a voice in the election of their Metropolitan. Innocent III., as we have seen, decided in favour of the monks.

Dispute between the monks of Canterbury and bishops about the election of Primate.

Religion began to decay, and various abuses made their appearance in England during the latter portion of the thirteenth century. This was chiefly owing to the undue interference of Henry III. in episcopal elections, and to the excessive taxes imposed by Edward I. on Church property to defray the expenses of the numerous wars in which he engaged. Thus the former frequently intruded his own unworthy favourites into episcopal sees, and left many

Decay of religion in England during the 13th century.

[1] Lingard, *History of England*, ii. 192.

benefices vacant for a long time, appropriating the revenues for himself; while the exactions of the latter impoverished the Church, and diverted to secular purposes what had been given for the advancement of religion.

Opposition to the Papacy during the 14th century.

During the fourteenth century, a strong feeling of opposition sprung up in England against the Papacy. This was owing—(*a*) to the efforts of the Popes to maintain their feudal supremacy over that kingdom to the bitter annoyance of many Englishmen; (*b*) to the heavy taxes imposed to defray the expenses of the crusades, and to maintain the Papal Court at Avignon; and (*c*) to the apparent alliance between the Avignon Popes and France, the enemy of England.

The Statutes of *Provisors* and *Praemunire*.

The feelings of the English people towards the Holy See found expression in various statutes passed during the fourteenth century, the chief being those of *Provisors* and *Praemunire*. By the former it was enacted that no collation, reservation or provision of a benefice made by the Court of Rome should have any effect; while the latter forbade all appeals from the courts of the realm to foreign tribunals on questions that could be decided in the kingdom.

The English Church during the 15th century.

During the fifteenth century a general decay of religious life manifested itself in England, owing to the negligence of the bishops, and the general inefficiency of the clergy.

The opposition to the Papacy, and the negligence of the English clergy in the discharge of their spiritual duties prepared the way for the rupture brought about between Rome and England by Henry VIII. in the sixteenth century.

B.—*In Ireland.*

The religious condition of Ireland at the commencement of this epoch was by no means encouraging. The country had not yet recovered from the effects of the Danish wars; its churches were mostly in ruins; its religious had been nearly all banished or slain; and the primatial see was still in the hands of laymen.

The Irish Church at the beginning of this epoch.

With the appointment of Celsus to the primacy, in 1105, a brighter era began to dawn on the Irish Church. Though a member of the ruling family, in whose hands the see of Armagh had remained so long, he sought to secure its independence of lay control, and laboured indefatigably to root out those abuses, among the clergy and laity that had made their appearance during a period of war and anarchy. He visited almost every part of Ulster, the province in which religion had suffered most from the negligence of his predecessors; and also made a visitation of Connaught and Munster, preaching to the people wherever he went both by word and example.

Celsus Archbishop of Armagh (1105-29).

Celsus held a national Council[1] at Usney, in Westmeath in 1112, at which fifty-one bishops attended. Various disciplinary measures were passed for the better government of the Church, the most noteworthy being that Cashel, the bishop of which had been already recognised as archbishop, should be made a metropolitan see, subject, however, to the see of Armagh. This enactment was afterwards approved by Innocent II. in 1139.

Council of Usney (1112).

Another important Council was held at Rate-Breasil,[2]

[1] Wilkins, *Conc. Brit. et Hib.*, i. 392.

[2] There is much doubt regarding the place designated by Rath-Breasil. While some (*e.g.*, Brenan, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, 226) say that it is situated in the County of Armagh, others, as Robertson (v. 265), suppose it to be Mount Rath, in Leinster. See Lanigan, iv. 27.

Council of Rath-Breasil (1118).

in 1118, under the presidency of Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, who had been recently appointed Papal legate in Ireland. The chief measure passed by this Council regarded the diocesan division of Ireland. It was enacted that the country should be divided into twenty-four dioceses, in addition to Dublin, which still yielded obedience to Canterbury, viz., twelve in the North and West subject to the Bishop of Armagh, and twelve in the South and East immediately subject to the Archbishop of Cashel, and through him to the primate.

St. Malachy.

The man, however, who laboured most successfully for the reformation of the Irish Church was the great St. Malachy, whose name has been always cherished by his countrymen. He was born of pious parents in Armagh, in the year 1095, and from his earliest years manifested a taste for the sacred ministry. He was ordained priest by Celsus, who made him vicar-general of the diocese. In this capacity he rendered invaluable assistance to the primate in carrying on the work of reformation. He shortly afterwards, however, resigned this office, and went to Lismore (about 1123) to study Sacred Scripture and canon law under the famous Bishop Malchus, who then presided over that school.

Appointed Bishop of Connor (1127).

Having completed his studies at Lismore, he returned to Ulster, in 1125,[2] and was appointed to the abbacy of Bangor, which he restored. Two years later he was consecrated Bishop of Connor, by Celsus. The condition of this diocese at the time is described in very dark colours by St. Bernard, the intimate friend and

[1] Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, iv. 73.

[2] Dr. Healy, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*, 394.

biographer of St. Malachy. "When he began to perform the duties of his office," writes St. Bernard,[2] "the servant of God soon began to think that he had been sent not to men but to beasts. Nowhere else had he experienced such people so shameless as to manners, so uncivilized as to rites, so impious as to faith, so barbarous as to laws, so stiffnecked as to discipline, and so filthy as to life. But the zealous labours of St. Malachy soon wrought a wonderful change among the people. Their wickedness soon ceased, their barbarism immediately disappeared, the Roman rites were introduced, the customs of the Church everywhere received; and finally, churches were rebuilt, and ministers appointed to minister to them."

Appointed Arc.-bishop of Armagh (1129).

Shortly before his death (1129), Celsus recommended St. Malachy to his clergy as a worthy successor. In accordance with this advice, the Bishop of Connor was selected to fill the vacant see. Owing, however, to the opposition of the ruling family, who claimed the appointment for one of their own members, named Maurice, he could not gain possession of the diocese till 1132, when the intruder died. Nor did he succeed in gaining an entrance into the city of Armagh for two years later, as another member of the ruling family had been intruded, and had taken possession of the cathedral and the episcopal insignia. St. Malachy continued to labour indefatigably for the reform of abuses throughout the diocese of Armagh till 1137, when he resigned that see, and became Bishop of Down.[2] On his recommendation Gelasius, Abbot

Resigns the see of Armagh (1137)

[1] *Vita S. Malachiae*, cap. viii.; Migne, *Lat. Patrol.*, clxxxii. 1083.

[2] Down and Connor had been originally two dioceses, but had been united for some time. St. Malachy introduced the former division, taking Down for himself. See Ware, *Bishops of Down*.

of the Monastery of Derry, was elected to the primatial see.

His first mission to Rome (1139).

St. Malachy set out for Rome, in 1139, to secure the approval of the Holy See for the elevation of Cashel to the metropolitan dignity, and to obtain palliums for the Archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. On his way to the Eternal City he stayed for some time in the Monastery of Clairvaux, where he formed the acquaintance of St. Bernard. On his arrival in Rome he was warmly received by Innocent II. The Pope readily assented to his petition in favour of Cashel; but refused to grant the palliums except at the request of a national Council. He also refused to allow St. Malachy, who was anxious to become a monk in Clairvaux, to resign his see. Before his departure from Rome he was created Papal legate in Ireland in place of Gillebert, who had recently resigned the dignity owing to age and infirmity.

His second mission to Rome (1148).

A national Council was held at Holmpatrick, in 1148, in which it was resolved to petition the Holy See for the palliums. At the request of the fathers, St. Malachy set out for Rome a second time to present their petition to the Pope. On his way thither he was taken ill at Clairvaux, where he died, after a brief sickness, on the 2nd November, 1148, the day he had foretold.

Cardinal Paparo sent to Ireland with four palliums.

Three years after the death of St. Malachy the Pope sent Cardinal Paparo to Ireland in company with Christian, Bishop of Lismore, who had been recently appointed Papal legate. They brought with them palliums not only for the Bishops of Armagh and Cashel, but also for those of Dublin and Tuam.

That the ceremony of conferring the palliums might be

performed with due solemnity, a national Council[1] was held at Kells, in 1152, under the presidency of Cardinal Paparo. Here various enactments were passed. Ireland was divided into four metropolitan and thirty-four suffragan sees, the primatial rights of Armagh remaining intact; simony and usury were condemned; and the payment of tithes to the clergy was commanded for the first time in Ireland. The last-mentioned enactment was not, however, enforced till the arrival of the English about twenty years later.

Synod of Kells (1152).

About the time of St. Malachy's death, another great saint and religious reformer made his appearance in the person of St. Laurence O'Toole,[2] whose life covers a period memorable in the annals of Ireland. Descended from the ancient house of the O'Tooles of Wicklow, he was entrusted at an early age to the care of the Bishop of Glendalough, who paid the greatest attention to the intellectual and moral training of his pupil. He soon evinced a decided taste for the religious state, and took the habit in the famous monastery of Glendalough, of which he was appointed abbot at the early age of twenty-five. On the death of the Bishop of Glendalough,[3] four years later,[4] he was elected to fill the vacant see. But he refused to accept the vacant dignity as he had not yet reached the canonical age.

St. Laurence O'Toole.

Appointed Abbot of Glendalough.

On the death of Gregory,[5] the first archbishop of Dublin,

---

[1] Wilkins, *Conc. Brit. et Hib.*, i. 425.

[2] His life was written by a canon regular of Eu, in Normandy, shortly after the saint's death. It has been published by Surius in his *Vitae Sanctorum*, vol. vi., pp. 342, &c.

[3] Ware, *Archbishops of Dublin.*

[4] Lanigan, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland* (2nd ed.), iv. 177.

[5] The interval between his refusal to accept the see of Glendalough and his appointment to Dublin appears uncertain. It is spoken of by his biographer (c. 10) as "*non breve tempus*," probably a few years. *Ibidem.*

Consecrated Archbishop of Dublin (1162).

in 1161, St. Laurence was elected his successor. In his new dignity he continued to lead the same strict mode of life to which he had been accustomed in his monastic retreat at Glendalough, wearing a hair shirt under his habit, and practising numerous other austerities. He was boundless in his charities, and most zealous in the discharge of the various duties of his office.

Arrival of Norman adventurers in Ireland (1169).

In the eighth year of his episcopate, some Anglo-Norman adventurers arrived in Ireland under the leadership of Strongbow, to restore MacMorrogh to the throne of Leinster, from which he had been expelled for having carried away the wife of O'Rorke of Breffni. They attacked Dublin, which they took after an obstinate struggle. In the course of the siege, St. Laurence frequently exposed himself to personal danger in his efforts to secure favourable terms for his people. Having learned shortly afterwards that the English adventurers had resolved to establish their supremacy over the country, and that they treated the vanquished with great cruelty, he urged Roderick O'Connor, the Ard-Righ, and the other chieftains of the country to unite for the expulsion of the invaders. The Archbishop's appeal failed to produce the concerted action that was essential to success. Some, however, acting on his advice, attacked the Anglo-Normans in Dublin; but were repulsed with great slaughter. Strongbow married Eva, the daughter of MacMorrogh; and on the death of his father-in-law, in 1170, succeeded to the chieftaincy of Leinster.

St. Laurence seeks to unite Irish chieftains against the invaders.

Arrival of Henry II. in Ireland (1171).

When Henry II. heard of the success of his subjects in Ireland, he felt that a golden opportunity had presented itself of effecting the conquest of that country which himself and his predecessors had been so long desiring.

Having made elaborate preparations, he sailed from England, accompanied by four hundred vessels, and landed at Waterford, in 1171. His suzerainty was immediately acknowledged[1] by the princes of Leinster and Munster; but the Ard-Righ and the princes of Ulster and Connaught refused to submit.

Synod of Cashel (1172).

Henry II. professed that he had come to Ireland as a friendly sovereign, in the interests of peace and religion, to restore order in a distracted country, and to reform various abuses. To give the semblance of sincerity to his professions he caused a synod to be held at Cashel, in 1172,[2] at which Christian presided. Most of the Irish bishops attended, with the exception of those from Ulster, who refused to appear; and some English ecclesiastics were present to represent the King. The synod acknowledged Henry II. as sovereign of Ireland, and passed seven disciplinary decrees,[3] the most noteworthy being the first,[4] forbidding marriage between relatives within the forbidden degrees; and the third, commanding the payment of tithes. Such was the extent of the legislation deemed necessary by those zealous English reformers to meet the needs of the alleged deplorable condition of the Irish Church.

On the departure of Henry II. from Ireland, early in the year 1172, divisions occurred among those whom he left

[1] According to Roger de Hoveden (*Chronicon*, Ad an. 1171), all the Irish chieftains submitted with the exception of the Ard-Righ.

[2] Lingard, accepting the authority of Gerald Barry (*Hibernia Expugnata*, lib. i., cap. xxxiv.), says that the Council was held towards the end of 1171.

[3] Wilkins, *Conc. Brit. et Hib.*, i. 472-473.

[4] Before the thirteenth century marriage had been prohibited between relatives of the seventh degree. In many countries, however, where the system of clanship prevailed, as in Ireland, there was a custom allowing marriage between relatives up to the fourth degree. This custom was approved by the fourth General Council of Lateran (1215).

The alleged Bull of Hadrian IV.

after him to defend his interests. Many of the native chieftains, taking advantage of these divisions, endeavoured to cast off the English yoke. In such circumstances, according to Gerald Barry,[1] a Welsh ecclesiastic, who was the chronicler of the King's expedition in Ireland, it was sought to maintain Henry's authority by appealing to the grant of the country alleged to have been made to him about twenty years previously by Hadrian IV. The Bull[2] containing the grant is said by the same chronicler to have been first produced at a synod held at Cashel, in 1175, a synod which is not as much as referred to by any contemporary Irish annalist.

---

[1] *Hibernia Expugnata*, lib. ii., cap. 5; *Opp. Gir. Cambr.* (Rolls Series), v. 317-318.

[2] A copy of the alleged Bull is given by Gerald Barry in his *Hibernia Expugnata*, lib. ii., cap. 6. from which it was copied by other English writers. An account of the way in which it is said to have been obtained is given in the last chapter of John of Salisbury's *Metalogicus*, written shortly after Hadrian's death, *i.e.*, in 1159 or 1160. We are told that when Henry II. heard of the accession of an Englishman in the person of Nicholas Breakspeare, to the Chair of St. Peter, he sent some bishops accompanied by John of Salisbury, who was then about twenty-two years of age, to congratulate him, and to obtain permission to invade Ireland, for the purpose of restoring order, and securing the observance of the laws of the Church in that country. It is said that he deemed it necessary to obtain the Pope's permission, as Ireland was one of those "islands on which Christ, the Son of Justice, shone;" and, therefore, belonged to the Holy See according to Constantine's forged Deed of Donation.

The arguments urged against the authenticity of the Bull by Dr. Lynch, Cardinal Moran, &c., may be thus briefly summarized;—

(*a*) It was not appealed to for about twenty years after it is said to have been obtained. It was not even referred to at the Synod of Cashel (1172), where we should obviously expect to find it brought forward to strengthen Henry's hands against those ecclesiastics who refused to acknowledge his authority. Nor, finally, is it referred to by any contemporary Irish annalist.

(*b*) The Bull, as given by Gerald Barry, was neither sealed, signed, nor dated, nor does it indicate the chancellor by whom it was delivered—omissions which do not occur in any of the twenty one undoubtedly genuine

Whatever may be said about the authenticity of this Bull, which many writers reject as spurious, it does not appear to have had much effect in determining the relations between England and Ireland. For, in the first place, even before it was appealed to by Henry, his suzerainty had been acknowledged by most of the Irish chieftains and bishops. And, secondly, the rude arms the Irish had at the time rendered it impossible for them to contend successfully against the Normans, who had been trained to much superior weapons of warfare. "The cross-bow," says

Its effects.

Bulls of Hadrian IV. extant. There exists a Bull addressed by Hadrian to Henry in 1159. In this Bull Henry is addressed by name; not so in the alleged grant. And finally it is dated from Rome; while John of Salisbury tells us in his *Pollycraticus*, vi., c. 24, that he met the Pope at Beneventum.

(*c*) The original copy of the Bull, though frequently searched for, has never been discovered.

(*d*) If Hadrian issued the Bull under consideration, his action would have been completely at variance with his attitude towards Louis of France in similar circumstances. Louis asked Hadrian for permission to invade Spain. The Pope, in reply, sought to dissuade him from carrying out his intention without the consent of the clergy and people (*inconsulta ecclesia et populo terrae illius*).

(*e*) Henry of Blois, Henry's secretary, whose duty it was to keep a faithful record of the chief events of the King's reign, does not refer to the alleged Bull directly or indirectly, though he speaks of the conquest of Ireland in one of his letters (Ep. 66, Migne's *Lat. Patrol*, ccvii. 196), and had, therefore, a fitting opportunity of mentioning the grant, had he been aware of it.

(*f*) The character of Henry II., which was well known to Hadrian would not point him out as a suitable person to undertake the reformation of the Irish Church. Lingard, *History of England*, ii. 105.

(*g*) The passage in the *Metalogicus* describing the circumstances in which the alleged grant was obtained bears all the appearance of being a forgery. First, it has no connection with what precedes or follows. And secondly, the *Metalogicus* was written, as we have seen, in 1159 or 1160; while in the passage referred to it is stated that the Pope made a grant of Ireland to Henry, "as his letters testify to *the present day*," a form of expression that would obviously not be used in chronicling an event that had occurred only four or five years previously. We are, therefore, left to rely chiefly on the authority of

Cardinal Moran.[1] "which was now used for the first time, caused as great a revolution in military tactics as the needle-gun in our own day."

English ecclesiastics in Ireland.

Numerous English ecclesiastics came to Ireland in the train of the conquerors, and were invariably appointed to the richest benefices in the country. They professed that they had come to reform the Irish Church; but they soon threatened to be its ruin. Many of them violated the laws of clerical celibacy, and we are told[2] that St. Laurence O'Toole sent as many as one hundred and forty of those who had been convicted of incontinency to Rome for absolution, to expose the character of the new reformers.

Death of St. Laurence (1180).

St. Laurence attended at the third General Council of Lateran, held in 1179, on which occasion he was appointed Papal legate in Ireland by Alexander III. He passed to his reward shortly afterwards at Eu, in Normandy,

---

Gerald Barry in proof of the authenticity of the Bull. And his authority will be scarcely deemed sufficient by anyone who has read the *Cambrensis Eversus* of Dr. Lynch, or the comments made on his character as a historian by Dimock and Brewer, the editors of the Rolls Series of his works.

It is urged, however, in favour of the authenticity of the Bull, that Alexander III. issued a Brief in September, 1172, confirming Hadrian's grant to Henry. If this Brief were genuine it would set the controversy at rest. But most writers maintain that it is a forgery—(*a*) It is different in style from the other letters of Alexander. (*b*) It is dated from Rome, whereas Alexander was absent at the time. And (*c*) even Gerald Barry himself admits that its genuineness was denied by many contemporary writers. He thus speaks of it in his *De Principis Instructione*: "Sicut a quibusdam impetratum asseritur aut confingitur; ab aliis autem unquam impetratum esse negatur." Hence Jaffé did not insert it in his *Regesta Pontificum*. For a fuller treatment of the genuineness of Hadrian's Bull, see *Cambrensis Eversus*, translated by Dr. Kelly, ii. 410; Stephen White, *Apologia pro Hibernia*; Lanigan, iv. 165, &c.; *Dublin Review*, July, 1883, April, 1884; *Irish Eccl. Record*, November, 1872, October, 1891.

[1] *Irish Eccl. Record*, November, 1872.

[2] *Vita S. Laurentii*, cap. xxiii., apud Surium, vi. 351.

on the 14th of November, 1180, and is said to have been the last Irishman who occupied the see of Dublin for over four centuries.

St. Laurence's successor in the see of Dublin was an Englishman named Comin,[1] who was elected at Evesham by some of the Dublin clergy, invited thither for the purpose by Henry II. He did not take possession of his see till 1184. In the course of the following year he held a provincial synod in Dublin, which confined itself entirely to renewing the decrees passed at Cashel in 1172. The most prominent speakers at the synod were Alban O'Mulloy, Abbot of Baltinglass, and Gerald Barry. The former inveighed in unspairing terms against the immorality of the English and Welsh clergy, and declared that up to the time of their arrival in Ireland the scandal of incontinent clergy had been unknown in the country. Gerald Barry, who was asked by the Archbishop to answer O'Mulloy, while ascribing many defects to the Irish clergy, was forced to admit that "they were very commendable for religion; and that, among the divers virtues which distinguished them, they excelled in the prerogative of chastity."[2]

Comin Archbishop of Dublin (1181-1212).

Synod held in Dublin (1185).

From the episcopate of Comin dates the origin of the

---

[1] He laid the foundation of St. Patrick's in 1190. It was situated in the diocese of Glendalough, which had been recently annexed to Dublin, and was made a cathedral by Comin's successor, Henry de Loundres; but was to yield precedence to the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, or Christ Church, as it has been called since the Reformation.

[2] *De Rebus a se gestis* cap. xiv.; *Opp.* (Rolls Series), i. 67. Gerald Barry at the same time attacked the Irish priests for their intemperate habits. "Inter tot enim millia," he says, "vix unum invenies qui post jugem tam jejuniorum quam orationum instantium vino variisque potionibus diurnos labores enormius quam deceret nocte non redimat." *Ibidem.*

controversy between the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin regarding the Primacy. He obtained a Bull from Lucius III. in 1182, on the occasion of his consecration, forbidding any archbishop or bishop to hold meetings *in the diocese of Dublin or to treat of the ecclesiastical affairs of that diocese* without the consent of the Archbishop of Dublin, unless such prelate were empowered to do so by the Roman Pontiff or his legate.[1] The obvious purpose of this Bull was to exempt the diocese of Dublin from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Armagh. The privilege which was confirmed to Comin's successor, Henry de Loundres (1212-28), by Innocent III., in 1216, was extended to the *Province of Dublin*,[2] by Honorius III. (1216-27) in 1221.

Origin of dispute between Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin about the Primacy.

Decision of Innocent VI. (1353).

These privileges gave rise to a controversy between the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, about the middle of the thirteenth century, which is said[3] to have been settled by Urban IV. confirming the former rights of Armagh. The controversy was revived early in the fourteenth century, when Roland Joyce, Archbishop of Armagh (1313-21), having had occasion to visit Dublin, had his cross carried publicly before him as a sign of jurisdiction. This was objected to by Leck, Archbishop of Dublin, and his clergy. A warm controversy ensued, which continued till 1353, when Fitzralph presided in Armagh, and John St. Paul in Dublin. The question having been referred to the Holy See, Innocent VI. decided that each of the archbishops should be primate, and that, for the sake of distinction, the Archbishop of Armagh should be styled Primate of All

[1] Ussher, *Opp.* (Dublin, 1847), vol. i., Ap. vi., page 130.

[2] *Ibidem*; MacMahon, *Jus Primatiale Armacanum*, 51.

[3] MacMahon, *Jus Primatiale Armacanum*, 14.

Ireland, and the Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland.[1] The right claimed by the Archbishop of Armagh to carry his cross in Dublin was left undecided, and continued to be for centuries afterwards a subject of controversy between the occupants of the two sees. About the middle of the sixteenth century, Queen Mary issued letters patent in favour of the primatial rights of Armagh,[2] which were confirmed in 1642, by Charles I.[3] Dr. Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, wrote a work in 1674, in which he sought to maintain the primatial rights of his see against the claims urged two years previously in favour of Armagh, by Archbishop Plunket. The controversy continued down to the eighteenth century, when Dr. MacMahon, Archbishop of Armagh, wrote his learned work, *Jus Primatiale Armacanum*, in defence of the rights of his see.

Decision of Queen Mary in favour of Armagh.

English ecclesiastics poured into Ireland in large numbers during the thirteenth century. We find, for instance, that as early as 1205 there were as many as eight Irish dioceses in their hands. And most of these foreign ecclesiastics do not appear to have been animated with a friendly feeling towards the native clergy. For Honorious III. ordered his legate to abolish the rule recently introduced, that no Irishman "however learned he might be" should be promoted to positions of trust in the Church. Many English ecclesiastics held civil offices, which frequently brought them into conflict with the people, and thereby alienated the affection of their spiritual children.

Irish ecclesiastics badly treated by imported bishops.

There were numerous houses of Cistercians, Dominicans,

---

[1] See MacMahon, *Jus Prim. Armac.*, 55.

[2] Ussher, *Opp.* i., Ap. vi., page 141.

[3] MacMahon, *Jus Prim. Armac.*, 71-73.

Cistercians, &c., in Ireland.

Augustinians, and Carmelites founded in Ireland during the thirteenth century. These religious contributed largely both by their preaching and example to foster piety and root out abuses among the people.

Irish Universities.

A Bull was issued by Clement V. in 1311, which was confirmed by John XXII. in 1320, authorizing the foundation of a University in Dublin. After continuing for about half a century, it was closed for want of funds. The University founded by the Irish Parliament at Drogheda, in 1365, on the model of Oxford, met with a similar fate.

The Irish, assisted by Edward Bruce, rise in rebellion (1315).

The oppression practised by the English towards their Irish subjects became so intolerable, that the latter invited Robert Bruce of Scotland, to assist them in asserting their independence. The offer was accepted, and Robert's brother, Edward Bruce, arrived in Ireland, in 1315, at the head of 6,000 men. In a very short time he succeeded in establishing his authority over most of the country, and was crowned King of Ireland at Dundalk. Edward II. of England succeeded, however, in misrepresenting the action of Bruce and his followers to John XXII., and thus secured their excommunication. The Irish chieftains forthwith addressed a remonstrance to the Pope, explaining how they had been maltreated by their English rulers. John wrote immediately to Edward, reprimanding him for his conduct, and appealing to him to treat his Irish subjects with mercy and kindness. The struggle of the Irish for independence was shortly afterwards terminated by the death of Bruce, at Dundalk, in 1318.

Statute of Kilkenny (1367).

The Pope's intervention appears to have moderated for a time the oppression of the Irish by their rulers. That the policy of moderation did not continue long, is sufficiently evident from the notorious Statute of Kilkenny, enacted in

1367, which forbade the English settlers to intermarry with the Irish, or to use the Irish language, and prohibiting any Irishman to obtain a benefice in the Church, or to be allowed to enjoy the privileges of religious life. And in the course of the fifteenth century, Richard O'Hedian, Archbishop of Cashel, was cited to appear before a Dublin parliament, on the charge that "he was kind and humane to the Irish, and had no respect whatever for the English; that he was never known to promote persons of that nation to any dignity in the Church; and that he allowed no bishop in his province to advance an Englishman to any benefice." The Archbishop was acquitted, as there was not a particle of evidence to support the charge alleged against him.

Richard O'Hedian of Cashel prosecuted.

C.—*In Scotland.*

Malcolm III. (1058-93) and his holy spouse, St. Margaret, laboured energetically, as we have seen, in the interests of religion, within their dominions. Their pious labours were continued by their son, David I. (1124-53), who was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the regular diocesan division of Scotland, having either founded or restored the six bishoprics of Glasgow, Aberdeen, Caithness, Ross, Brechin, and Dunblane. He was munificent in his charitable donations, built numerous churches, and erected several monasteries, the most famous being that of Melrose. The Cistercians and Augustinian Canons, who were introduced into Scotland during the twelfth century, contributed their share to bring about a revival of religion and learning in that country.

The Scotch Church during the 12th century

The Scotch Church was distracted during the greater part of the twelfth century by the rival claims of the

Dispute between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York about jurisdiction over Scotch Church.

Archbishops of Canterbury and York to jurisdiction over it. The dispute originated with the appointment of Edmer, a monk of Canterbury, to the see of St. Andrews, in 1120. Having been invested with the temporalities of the see by the King, Alexander I. (1106-24), he claimed the right[1] of being consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who he said enjoyed jurisdiction over Scotland. The King having objected to this, Edmer declared that he would not sever his connection with the see of Canterbury for the whole Scotch Church, and forthwith resigning his title to St. Andrews returned to England. The vacant see was filled by the appointment of Robert, Prior of Scone, who was consecrated by the Archbishop of York, with the understanding that the rights of his see should be fully recognised.

Decision of Alexander III. (1113).

After the controversy had continued for about forty years, the question was referred to the Holy See. Alexander III. having examined the claims of the two Archbishops decided (1163) that the Scotch Church was independent of everyone, except the Bishop of Rome. This decision was subsequently ratified by Clement III. and Celestine III.

Though neither of the Archbishops appear to have had any valid title[2] to jurisdiction over Scotland, their claims

[1] The bishops of St. Andrews appear to have been originally consecrated either by the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury. But Lanfranc allowed the ceremony to be performed by the Archbishop of York.

[2] The claim of the Archbishop of York was chiefly based on the fact that the bishops of some of the southern dioceses of Scotland, which had been formerly included in the Kingdom of Northumbria, yielded obedience to him as their metropolitan; while the claim of Canterbury was supported by arguments similar to those by which it had been sought at a somewhat earlier date to establish the authority of that see over Ireland.

were favoured by the English sovereigns, who sought thereby to prepare the way for establishing their civil authority over that country. A fitting opportunity of uniting the two countries under one crown seemed to present itself in 1290, when, on the death of the Maid of Norway, the last of the Scotch royal line, the rival claimants for the vacant throne appealed to Edward I. of England. The latter decided in favour of Baliol; requiring, however, that he should acknowledge the suzerainty of the English crown.

Edward I. recognised as Lord Suzerain of Scotland.

Baliol was soon made to regret his having accepted the kingdom as a fief of the King of England. He was frequently cited by his lord suzerain to appear in England, to answer frivolous charges alleged against him. Baliol at length refused to obey these citations, for which he was declared guilty of high treason, and deposed from the throne. Edward led a large army into Scotland to give effect to his sentence of deposition, and defeated the Scots at the battle of Dunbar, in 1296, after which Baliol surrendered, and was committed to imprisonment in the Tower of London.

Wars between England and Scotland.

The Scots, though defeated, were not disheartened. They renewed their attempt, under William Wallace, to assert their independence; but were defeated at the battle of Falkirk, in 1298. As a last resoure they appealed to Boniface VIII., as their liege lord, to protect their country against the English invaders. The Pope immediately addressed a letter to Edward, warning him not to interfere with a country placed under the special protection of the Holy See, and admonishing him to release the Scotch ecclesiastics whom he kept in confinement. He concluded by ordering the king, if he persisted in his claims, to send

The Scots defeated at Falkirk (1298).

They appeal to the Pope as their Lord Suzerain.

representatives to Rome to justify his title. An armistice was agreed to in order that the claims of Edward should be examined. The question was referred by him to his own Parliament, which decided (1301), as we should expect, in his favour. Edward refused to send representatives to Rome: but wrote a letter to the Pope setting forth the claims of the English crown to Scotland, which were mostly based on the fabulous history of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Dispute referred to English Parliament.

Boniface prevented from defending the interests of Scotland.

War was shortly afterwards renewed between England and Scotland. Victory declared at first in favour of the former country. Wallace fell into the hands of his enemies, and after the mock formality of a trial was beheaded in London, in 1305. The struggle in which Boniface was at the time engaged with Philip of France rendered it impossible for him to defend the interests of Scotland against England.

The Pope charged with ambition.

Boniface has been frequently charged with ambition for having claimed suzerainty over Scotland. The groundlessness of this charge will appear if we bear in mind—(*a*) that the Pope's claim was acknowledged by the Scots themselves, and defended by the representatives whom they sent to Rome; and (*b*) that the claim of the Papacy to suzerainty over Scotland had been urged and admitted, as shown by Dr. Lingard, long before the time of Boniface VIII.

At length, however, the Scots, led on by their great hero Robert Bruce, gained a signal victory over the English at the battle of Bannockburn (1314), and established their independence. The border country, however,

---

[1] *History of England*, ii. 560.

continued to be ravaged for about two centuries by the English. The wars which ensued, as well as civil strife among the native chieftains, had most injurious effects on religion and civilization in Scotland during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The primacy of the see of St. Andrews was confirmed by Sixtus IV., in 1474.[1] Eighteen years later Glasgow was erected into a metropolitan see by Innocent VIII., with Dunkeld, Dunblane, Galloway, and Argyle, as suffragan sees, the other seven Scotch sees remaining subject to the Archbishop of St. Andrews.

[1] Many writers, while admitting that St. Andrews had enjoyed a pre-eminence among the Scotch sees before 1474, hold that it was not a metropolitan see before that year.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF POPES AND WESTERN EMPERORS.

FROM A.D. 1073 TO A.D. 1517.

[*Those whose names are in brackets were Antipopes.*]

ELEVENTH CENTURY.

POPES. NAME	DURATION OF PONTIFICATE	EMPERORS. NAME	DURATION OF REIGN
Gregory VII.	1073-1085	Henry IV.	1056-1106
(Clement III. 1080-1100.)			
Victor III.	1086-1087		
Urban II.	1088-1099		
Paschal II.	1099-1118		

TWELFTH CENTURY.

Gelasius II.	1118-1119	Henry V.	1106-1125
Calixtus II.	1119-1124	Lothaire II.	1125-1137
Honorius II.	1124-1130	Conrad III.	1137-1152
Innocent II.	1130-1143	Frederick I.	1152-1190
(Anacletus II. 1130-38.)		Henry VI.	1190-1197
Celestine II.	1143-1144	Philip of Swabia[1]	1198-1208
Lucius II.	1144-1145	Otho IV.	1198-1212
Eugene III.	1145-1153		
Anastasius IV.	1153-1154		
Hadrian IV.	1154-1159		
Alexander III.	1159-1181		
(Victor IV. 1159-64.)			
(Paschal III. 1164-68.)			
(Calixtus III. 1168-78.)			
(Innocent III. 1178-80.)			
Lucius III.	1181-1185		
Urban III.	1185-1187		
Gregory VIII.	1187		
Clement III.	1187-1191		
Celestine III.	1191-1198		
Innocent III.	1198-1216		

[1] Philip and Otho were elected by rival parties.

THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

POPES.		EMPERORS.	
NAME	DURATION OF PONTIFICATE	NAME	DURATION OF REIGN
Honorius III	1216-1227	Frederick II.	1212-1250
Gregory IX.	1227-1241	Conrad IV.	1250-1254
Celestine IV.	1241	Rudolph of Hapsburg	1273-1291
Innocent IV.	1243-1254	Adolph of Nassau	1292-1298
Alexander IV.	1254-1261	Albert I.	1298-1308
Urban IV.	1261-1264		
Clement IV.	1265-1268		
Gregory X.	1271-1276		
Innocent V.	1276		
Hadrian V.	1276		
John XXI.	1276-1277		
Nicholas III.	1277-1280		
Martin IV.	1281-1285		
Honorius IV	1285-1287		
Nicholas IV.	1288-1292		
Celestine V.	1294		
Boniface VIII.	1294-1303		

FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

Benedict XI.	1303-1304	Henry VII.	1308-1313
Clement V.	1305-1314	Louis of Bavaria	1314-1347
John XXII.	1316-1334	Frederick of Austria	1314-1330
Benedict XII.	1334-1342	Charles IV.	1347-1378
Clement VI.	1342-1352	Wenceslaus	1378-1400
Innocent VI.	1352-1362		
Urban V.	1362-1370		
Gregory XI	1370-1378		
Urban VI.	1378-1389		
(Clement VII. 1378-94.)			
Boniface IX.	1389-1404		
(Benedict XIII. 1394-1424.)			

FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

Innocent VII.	1404-1406	Rupert	1400-1410
Gregory XII.	1406-1415	Sigismund	1410-1437
(Alexander V. 1409-1410.)		Albert II.	1438-1439
(John XXIII. 1410-1415.)		Frederick III.	1440-1493

LIST OF POPES AND WESTERN EMPERORS.

FIFTEENTH CENTURY—CONTINUED.

POPES.		EMPERORS.	
NAME	DURATION OF PONTIFICATE	NAME	DURATION OF REIGN
Martin V.	1417-1431	Maxmilian I.	1493-1519
Eugene IV.	1431-1447		
(Felix V. 1439-49.)			
Nicholas V.	1448-1455		
Calixtus III.	1455-1458		
Pius II.	1458-1464		
Paul II.	1464-1471		
Sixtus IV.	1471-1484		
Innocent VIII.	1484-1492		
Alexander VI.	1492-1503		

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Pius III.	1503	Charles V.	1519-1556
Julius II.	1503-1513		
Leo X.	1513-1521		

ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

	PAGE
Abbreviators, Court of	355
Abelard	183
Acre, Siege of	124
Adelaide	9
Aeneas Silvius	324
Agnes, mother of Henry IV.	8
Agnes, daughter of Duke of Merania	72
Albert the Great	193
Albigenses	211
Alexander II.	4, 23
Alexander III.	50-59
Alexander IV.	100, 166
Alexander V.	312
Alexander VI.	365
Alexander of Hales	192
Alexandria, City of	56
Alphonsus of Naples	369
Amalric of Bena	191
America	366
Anacletus II. (antipope)	37-39
Andrews, See of St.	425, 426
Angelus, Origin of	349
Anselm, St., as scholastic	178
Anselm, St., as churchman	393
Anselm of Laon	184
Anthonists	147
Anthony's, St., fire	147
Aristotle, his works	191
Armenians	343
Arnold of Brescia	41
Aschaffenburg, Concordat of	345
Augustine, Rule of St.	146
Augustinian Friars,	172
Averrhoës	191, 293
Avignon	260
Avignon, The Popes of	260-281
Bacon, Roger	193
Bajazet I.	308
Bajazet II.	363
Baliol, King of Scotland	425
Barbarossa, Frederick	43
Basle, Council of	324
Basle and Florence, the Councils of	324-344
Beatific Vision	268
Becket, St. Thomas à	396-406
Beghards	204
Benedict XII.	270
Benedict XIII.	306
Benedictus Deus, The Bull	272
Bernard, St.	137
Bertha, wife of Henry IV.	8, 9, 15
Berthold, founder of Carmelites	170
Beziers, Capture of	215
Black Plague	275
Blanche of Castile	103
Bolsena, Miracle of	294
Bonaventure, St.	194
Boniface VIII., Pontificate of	238-259
Boniface VIII. and Scotland	425
Boniface IX.	304
Borgia, Caesar	370
Borgia, Lucretia	370
Bradwardine, Thomas	200
Bramante	374
Brethren of the Free Spirit	204
Bridget, St., of Sweden	278
British Isles, Condition of religion in	391-427

	PAGE
Bruce, Edward	422
Bruno, St.	142
Bull, Alleged, of Hadrian IV.	416
Bull of Partition	367
Burchard	370
Calixtines	389
Calixtus II.	33
Calixtus III.	349
Calixtus (antipope)	57
Calvin on heavy punishment for heresy	236
Cambray, League of	374
Canon Law, The Body of	281
Canossa, Henry IV. at	14
Canterbury, Archbishop of, claims jurisdiction over Scotland	424
Carmelites	169
Carthusians	142
Cashel made a metropolitan see	412
Cashel, Synod of	415
Cathari, The	210
Catherine, St., of Sienna	279
Catherine, St., of Sweden	378
Celestine V.	238-242
Celsus, Archbishop of Armagh	409
Censius organizes a conspiracy against Gregory VII.	10
Charles II. of Naples	239-243
Charles IV. of Germany	273
Charles V. of France	303
Charles of Anjou	100
Charter of Charity	137
Christian, Bishop of Lismore	412
Church and State, Relations between	227
Cistercians	136
Citeaux	136
Clairvaux	139
Clarendon, Council of	402
Clarendon, *Constitutions* of	403
Clement III.	59, 62
Clement III. (antipope)	17, 18, 30
Clement IV.	100, 111
Clement V. (261); his relations with the Templars	286, 291
Clement VI.	273
Clement VII.	300
Clermont, Council of	119
Collection of laws of Sicily	91
Collection of Decretals made by St. Raymond of Pennaforte	91
Colonnas, their quarrel with Boniface VIII.	244
Columbus, Christopher	366
Comin, Archbishop of Dublin	419
Compact of Basle	390
Compact of Iglau	390
Conceptualism	180
Conrad III.	63
Conrad IV.	98, 99
Conradin	100
Consolamentum	212
Constance, wife of Henry VI.	64
Constance, Treaty of	57
Constance, Council of	314
Constantine XII., Eastern Emperor	346
Constantinople, Latin Kingdom of	126
Constantinople, Capture of, by the Turks	346
Conventuals	166
Corpus Christi, Feast of	294
Courtenay, Bishop of London	380
Crown, Iron, of Lombardy	47
Crusade First	117
,, Second	122
,, Third	123
,, Fourth	125
,, Fifth	127
,, Sixth	59
,, Seventh	107
,, Eighth	112
Crusades, The	115-132
Crusades, Effects of	130

	PAGE
Damasus II.	3
Damian, St. Peter	8
Dante and Boniface VIII.	257
David of Dinanto	191
David, King of Scotland	423
Deliberation, The	68
Denys, Pseudo-, the Areopagite	202
Dictate of Gregory VII.	24
Diego, Bishop of Osma	155
Diet, meaning of term	12
Doctoris Gentium, The Bull	331
Dominic, St.	155
Dominicans, The	155
Dominicans, The, and the Inquisition	224
Down and Connor, Sees of	411
Ducas, Alexius	126
Duns, John, Scotus	198
Durandus	200
Dublin made a metropolitan see	412
Dublin, Dispute between, and Armagh regarding the Primacy	420
Eckhart, Henry	204
Edessa, Latin principality of	121
Elias, The Prophet	169
Elias of Cortona	165
Eloisa and Abelard	185
England, Religious condition of	391
Enzio	94, 99
Eugene III.	44, 48
Eugene IV.	325-340
Execrabilis, The Bull	353
Factum of Urban VI.	295-301
Falkirk, Battle of	424
Felix, St., of Valois	148
Felix V. (antipope)	333
Ferdinand of Spain	229
Ferdinand of Naples	362
Ferrer, St. Vincent	319
Feudal System	27
Filioque, Question of the	339
Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh	173
Flagellants	276
Florence, Council of	335
Fontrevaud, Order of	147
Francis, St.	160
Franciscans, The	160
Fratricellian Spiritualists	167
Frederick I. of Germany	43-59
Frederick II. of Germany	64, 65, 70, 85-97
Friars	172
Gallican writers on decrees of Constance	318
Gaston	147
Gerald Barry	416
Gerhard	167
Gerson	307, 317
Ghibellines	62
Gilbert de la Porrée	191
Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick	410
Godfrey of Bouillon	17, 120
Golden Bull of Charles IV.	67
Grammont, Order of	134
Gratian, John	3
Gregory VII., Pontificate of	2-26
Gregory VIII.	59
Gregory IX.	88
Gregory XI.	279, 296
Gregory XII.	309, 319
Guelfs	62
Guerin	147
Guibert (antipope)	10, 17, 19
Guigo	145
Guiscard, Robert	18
Guy of Montefelto	246
Hadrian IV.	45-50
Hadrian IV., Alleged Bull of	416
Harding, Stephen	137
Henry I. of England	29, 395
Henry II. of England	396, 414
Henry III. of Germany	8
Henry IV. of Germany	5, 9, 13, 18

	PAGE
Henry V. of Germany	30-32
Henry VI. of Germany	60
Henry of Lausanne	219
Heresy, Capital punishment for	223
Heretical Sects of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries	210-220
Heretical Sects of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries	379-390
Herluin, founder of Bec	178
Herman of Luxemburg	17
Hildebrand	2, 3
Hohenstaufens, origin of name	43
Hohenstaufens, Struggle between the Papacy and the (first period)	45-60
Hohenstaufens, Struggle between the Papacy and the (second period)	85-102
Holmpatrick, Synod of	412
Holy League	375
Homage, Oath of	29, 34
Honorius II.	151
Honorius III.	85
Horebites	389
Hospitallers	150
Hugh of Clugny	5
Hugh the White	10, 16
Hugh of St. Victor	189
Huniades	350
Hussites, The	384
Huss, John	384
Imitation of Christ, Authorship of	209
Infessura, Stephen	349
Ingeburga	70-73
Innocent II., Pontificate of	35-42
Innocent III., Pontificate of	61-84
Innocent III. (antipope)	57
Innocent IV.	94, 99
Innocent VI.	277, 420
Innocent VII.	309
Investiture condemned	8
Investiture, Controversy about	27-34
Inquisition, The	221-237
Inquisition, The Roman	221
Inquisition, the Spanish	229
Iolanthe, daughter of King of Jerusalem	88
Ireland, Invasion of, by Anglo-Normans	414
Ireland, Religious condition of	410
Irnerius	177
Isabella of Castile	229
Ivo, Bishop of Chartres	33
Jacobites	344
James of Molay	287
Jerome of Ascoli (Nicholas IV.)	194
Jerome of Prague	388
Jerusalem taken by Christians (1219); taken by Saladin	123
Jews in Spain	230
Joan of Arc	350
Joanna of Naples	303
John XXII.	265
John XXIII.	313
John of Capistran, St.	350, 390
John de Gray	76
John Lackland	73-82
John of Matha, St.	148
John of Jandun	268
John, Knights of St.	150
John Duns Scotus	198
John of Oliva	293
Jubilee, Centennial	256
Julian, Cesarini	325, 328, 337
Julius II.	374
Kells, Synod of	413
Khan, The Great	108
Kilkenny, Statute of	422
Knights Templars, The Suppression of the	282-294
Lanfranc	392
Langton, Stephen	76
Lateran, First General Council of	34

	PAGE
Lateran, Second General Council of	40
Lateran, Third General Council of	57
Lateran, Fourth General Council of	82
Lateran, Fifth General Council of	376
Laurence O'Toole, St.	413
Legnano, Battle of	56
Leo IX.	4, 18, 35
Leo X.	377
Leopold of Austria	124
Llorente	232
Lollards	383
Lombard Confederation	54, 56
Lombard, Peter	189
Louis VIII. of France	103
Louis IX. of France	103-114
Louis of Bavaria	265-273
Lucius III.	58
Lyons, First General Council of	95
MacMahon, Archbishop of Armagh	428
Magna Charta	80
Malachy, St.	410
Malatesta, Charles	319
Manfred	99, 100
Mantua, Meeting of princes of Europe at	353
Marco Polo	109
Margaret, wife of St. Louis	105
Margaret of Scotland	423
Maronites	344
Martin V.	320
Martin V. confirms decrees of Constance	321
Marsilius of Padua	268
Matilda of Tuscany	14, 20, 92
Medici, The	359
Mendicant Orders	154
Mercy, Orders of	147
Michael of Caesena	167
Middle Ages, General character of	1
Middle Ages, Power of Popes during	23
Military Orders	149
Mohammed II.	359
Monarchy, Sicilian	64
Montfort, Simon of	214
Moors of Spain	230, 233
Moravian Brethren	390
Mysticism	201-209
Mystics, German	203
Mystics, Scholastic	202
Napoleon I. on Gregory VII.	26
Nepotism of Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII.	361, 364
Nestorians reconciled with the Church	344
Nicholas II.	4, 5, 19
Nicholas III.	166
Nicholas V. (antipope)	267
Nicholas V.	345
Nicholas of Myra, St.	134
Nicholas of Clemanges	305
Nicholas of Cusa	329
Nominalism	180
Norbert, St.	144
Normans in Italy	18, 19, 41
Normans in England	391
Northampton, Council of	403
Ockham, William of	108, 200
O'Connor, Roderick	414
O'Hedian, Archbishop of Cashel	423
Octavian (antipope)	51
Oldcastle, Sir John	383
Oliva, Peter of	167
Orders, Contemplative	133
Orders of Mercy	147
Orders, Military	149
Orders, Mendicant	154
Orphans (Hussites)	389
Otho, claimant for German throne	69, 70
O'Toole, St. Laurence	413
Otranto, Capture of, by Turks	359

	PAGE
Palaeologus, Michael	336, 347
Palestine, Condition of, before the twelfth century	116
Paparo, Cardinal	412
Paschal II.	30-33
Paschal III. (antipope)	52
Paul II.	243
Pavia, Council of	324
Pazzi	359
Peter D'Ailly	305
Peter de Bruis	219
Peter the Hermit	117
Peter Flotte	252
Peter de Vineis	99
Peter Leonis, Schism of	35-39
Peter Lombard	189
Peter of Nolasco, St.	149
Peter's, St.	374
Petrarch	273
Petrobrusians	219
Philip I. of France	29
Philip Augustus	70-73, 104
Philip the Fair and Boniface	247
Philip the Fair and the Templars	284
Philip of Swabia	67, 69
Piacenza, Council of	119
Pisa, Conventicle of	375
Pisa, Council of	310
Pius II.	352
Platonic Philosophy, Revival of	348
Plenary indulgence granted to the Crusaders	119
Popes, The political	358
Porcaro, The conspiracy of	349
Praemunire, Statute of	408
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges	378
Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis	110
Premonstratensians	144
Prester John	109
Primacy of Bishop of Rome defined by Council of Florence	340, 341
Princes, Concordat of	335
Printing, Invention of	348
Privilege of the Forum	400
Procession of the Holy Ghost	340
Procopius	389
Provisors, Statute of	408
Prussians, Conversion of	153
Purgatory, Discussion about	338
Rath-Breasil, Synod of	410
Raymond of Pennaforte, St.	91, 149
Raymond of Toulouse	214
Realism	180
Reginald, Sub-prior of Canterbury	75
Religious Orders	133-174
Republicanism, Medieval	41
Richard of St. Victor	189
Richard Cœur-de-Lion	121-123
Rienzi	274
Robert of Arbrissel	147
Robert of Molesme	136
Robert of Sorbonne	107
Rockingham, Council of	394
Roger I. of Sicily	64
Roger II. of Sicily	40, 48
Roncaglia, Meeting of jurisconsults at	49
Rosary, The	157
Roscellin	180
Royal Customs	401
Rudolph of Swabia	15-17
Ruysbroek, John	207
Saale, Battle of	17
Sabbatine Bull	172
Sainte Chapelle	107
Safe-conduct	386
Saladin Tax	123
Sautre, William	383
Savonarola	371
Sbinko, Archbishop of Prague	385
Scanderbeg	357
Scapular, The	171
Schism, The Great Western	295-323
Scholasticism	175-200

	PAGE
Scotland, Religion in	423
Scotus, John Duns	198
Secular Clergy and Mendicants	172
Seljurk Turks	116
Sentences, Books of the	189
Sententiaries, The	189
Sicilian Monarchy	62
Sicilian Vespers	101
Sicily	64, 100, 101
Sigismund	314, 319, 328, 386
Simony condemned	6
Sixtus IV.	358
Sorbonne	107
Spanish Inquisition	229
Spiritualists, Fratricellian	167
Squin of Florian	284
Stephen, founder of the Order of Grammont	134
Stephen, King of England	395
Stephen Langton	76, 81
Stigmata of St. Francis of Assisi	163
Stigmata of Catherine of Sienna	279
Stock, St. Simon	171
Suso, Henry	206
Swabian code	13
Syropulus	336
Taborites	389
Tamerlane	308
Tancred	60
Tartars	96
Tauler	205
Templars, Order of	151
Templars, Suppression of the	282-294
Temporal power of the Popes	21-24
Tertiary Dominicans	159
Tertiary Franciscans	164
Teutonic Knights	153
Thaddeus of Suessa	96, 97, 99
Theobald, Count of Champagne	104
Theodoric of Niem	295
Thomas of Aquin, St.	195
Thomas à Kempis	207
Three Kings, Relics of	43
Toleration in religious matters	226
Torquemada	232
Toulouse, Council of	223
Tours, Council of	53
Trinitarians	148
Turks, The	117
Unam Sanctam, The Bull	254
Universals	180
Universities	177
Universities, Irish	422
Urban II.	29, 64, 65
Urban III.	59
Urban V.	277
Urban VI.	296
Usney, Council of	409
Utraquism	388
Vatican Library, The	347
Venerabilem, The Decretal	68
Venice, Treaty of	57
Victor III.	29
Victor IV. (antipope)	39, 51, 55
Victoria, Fortress of	98
Vienna, General Council of	290
Villani, his account of Clement V.'s election	262
Vincent Ferrer, St.	319
Vision, Question of the Beatific	268
Vox in Excelso, The Bull	291
Waldenses	216
Waldo, Peter	216
Waleys	268
Wallace	424
Wat Tyler	381
Westminster, Council of	401
Wicliffe	379
Wicliffites, The	379
William of Nogaret	255
William the Conqueror	22, 23, 391
William Rufus	29, 392

	PAGE
William II. of Sicily	56, 58
William, Count of Holland	108
William Tell	264
William of St. Amour	173
William of Champeaux	183
William of Ockham	108, 200
Worms, Concordat of	33, 43, 44
Ziska	388
Zizim	363

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LTD., PRINTERS, DUBLIN.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
BR145.G541897 C001 V002
MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY 2ND ED. DUBLI
3 0311 00013 3491

46273

BR 145 .G54 1897
Gilmartin, Thomas, 1861-
Manual of church history
v.2

BR 145 .G54 1897
Gilmartin, Thomas, 1861-
Manual of church history
v.2

3 0000 00013 2491